

Research Report 1214

LEVEL 14

12

**SUBGROUP DIFFERENCES IN MILITARY-RELATED
PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES:
IMPLICATIONS FOR ROTC RECRUITMENT**

T. R. Armstrong, W. S. Farrell,
and J. J. Card
American Institutes for Research

ADA082081

DTIC
ELECTE
MAR 20 1980
S D C

PERSONNEL AND MANPOWER TECHNICAL AREA



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1979

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

80 3 19 069

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director

WILLIAM L. HAUSER
Colonel, U S Army
Commander

Research accomplished for the
Department of the Army

American Institutes for Research

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN PERI-P, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

FINAL DISPOSITION This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

18 ARI 19 RR-1214

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 9 Research Report	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) SUBGROUP DIFFERENCES IN MILITARY-RELATED PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES: IMPLICATIONS FOR ROTC RECRUITMENT		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED --
7. AUTHOR(s) T. R. Armstrong, W. S. Farrell, and J. J. Card		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER AIR-76501-4/79-TR
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS American Institutes for Research P.O. Box 1113, Palo Alto, CA 94302		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) MDA903-78-C-2050
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Army Training and Doctrine Command Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for ROTC Fort Monroe, VA 26351 (ROTC/TRADOC)		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 20163731A768
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333		12. REPORT DATE October 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 99
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) --		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES --		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Army Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) Influencers ROTC cadets Recruitment Non-ROTC students Personal value set Attitudes and beliefs Awareness and information		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A survey of 931 freshman and sophomore ROTC cadets and non-cadet students was conducted to provide (a) input to a national advertising campaign for ROTC, and (b) information to ROTC regional commands and Professors of Military Science. Data were crosstabulated according to ROTC membership, race, and sex. Subgroups were quite similar except in family income and type of home community. White non-ROTC students reported the highest family income, and black ROTC cadets the lowest. The overall favorite TV shows were Mork and (Continued)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Item 20 (Continued)

Mindy, MASH, and 60 Minutes. The favorite radio programming was FM and rock. More ROTC cadets majored in physical/biological sciences, and engineering. About 16% of the cadets gave 'military officer' as their first career choice. A higher percentage of cadets than non-cadets reported that people were influential on their decision to join ROTC, whereas more non-ROTC students reported that their personal beliefs and career goals were influential in their decision not to join ROTC. The majority of cadets had decided to join ROTC while still in high school.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special

Unclassified

ii SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

SUBGROUP DIFFERENCES IN MILITARY-RELATED PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES: IMPLICATIONS FOR ROTC RECRUITMENT

T. R. Armstrong, W. S. Farrell,
and J. J. Card
American Institutes for Research

Jack M. Hicks, ARI Project Scientist

Submitted by:
M. A. Fischl, Acting Chief
PERSONNEL AND MANPOWER TECHNICAL AREA

Approved by:

E. Ralph Dusek, Director
**PERSONNEL AND TRAINING
RESEARCH LABORATORY**

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

October 1979

Army Project Number
2Q163731A768

Officer Accession
and Training

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

FOREWORD

The Personnel and Manpower Technical Area of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) is concerned with providing a research base to use in the accession and retention of quality college students in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC). This report is the third in a continuing effort to explore high school and collect students' perceptions and opinions of ROTC and to compare ROTC cadets with non-ROTC students.

Research is conducted by personnel of AKI and contractors selected for their ability and experience. This report presents the results of a survey conducted by the American Institutes for Research under Contract #DA903-78-C-2050. The research was accomplished under Army Project 2Q163731A768, FY79 Work Program, in response to requirements from the Army Training and Doctrine Command's Deputy Chief of Staff for ROTC (ROTC/TRADOC). The survey was supported by the Advertising/Media Division of ROTC/TRADOC, and it has been particularly valuable to ROTC regional commands and professors of military science nationwide, as well as to the official Army advertising agency, N. W. Ayer. Guidance and support were provided by the ARI Contracting Officer's Technical Representative, Mr. Anthony Castelnovo; by COL William McKay and Mr. Wesley Williams of the Advertising/Media Division of ROTC/TRADOC; and by Dr. John Weldon of the Training Division, ROTC/TRADOC.


JOSEPH ZEIDNER
Technical Director

BRIEF

Requirement

A survey of freshman and sophomore college students, half of whom were enrolled in the U.S. Army Reserve Officer's Training Corps (ROTC) Basic Course, was conducted to: (a) provide input to the national advertising and recruiting campaign conducted for ROTC by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), and (b) provide information to the ROTC regional commands and Professors of Military Science (PMSs) for use in regional and local recruiting efforts.

Procedure

Usable data were gathered from 931 college students stratified according to sex, ethnic background, and membership in ROTC by means of a 232-item self-administering questionnaire. The students were drawn from eight colleges and universities sampled to be representative of those national campuses having an ROTC program, with the addition of a special sample of five universities chosen for their Hispanic populations. The data obtained were subjected to rigorous quality control procedures and were analyzed by computer. The processed data were divided into eight general groups of variables and were examined separately for ROTC cadets and non-ROTC students, and (within each of these categories) for males and females, and for blacks, Hispanics, and whites.

Findings

Except for average family income and the type of community in which they grew up, the subgroups were quite similar. White non-ROTC students reported the highest family income and black ROTC cadets reported the lowest. A higher percentage of ROTC cadets than students reported contacts with military personnel while growing up, and the cadets rated the opinions of their parents and friends about an Army officer career higher than did students. Generally, whites reported relatives of earlier generations with military experience while blacks and Hispanics reported relatives of their own generation.

Newspapers, television and radio, general magazines, and sports/outdoor magazines were the media most frequently attended to by the sample. There were some differences between males and females and among the different ethnic groups, but the most widely read magazines were Time, Newsweek, TV Guide, Reader's Digest, Sports Illustrated, National Geographic, People, and U.S. News and World Report. The overall favorite television shows were Mork and Mindy, MASH, and 60 Minutes; the favorite radio programming was FM and rock.

Relatively more ROTC cadets were majoring in the physical and biological sciences and engineering in college, while relatively more non-ROTC students were majoring in the social sciences or liberal arts. Overall, males and females tended to have traditional majors, with relatively more whites in physical science and engineering, relatively fewer Hispanics in business, and relatively more blacks and Hispanics in "Other" categories. Cadets attributed a greater influence to relatives, counselors, and those

in the career on their educational plans than did non-ROTC students. The mother was a stronger influence than the father on educational planning for everyone except the white cadets.

The career choices of the cadets and non-ROTC students followed their college majors. About 16% of the cadets gave military officer as their first career choice and over 50% identified it as one of their first three choices. More male than female cadets (60% vs 35%) placed military officer in their first three choices, but the three ethnic groups were similar. Cadets and non-ROTC students tended to agree on the most and least important dimensions of a job and on the dimensions most and least expected to be satisfied in the Army, but cadets' ratings of expected Army satisfaction were significantly higher than the generally positive non-ROTC student ratings. Females and Hispanics rated the potential Army satisfaction highest.

Non-ROTC students possessed generally accurate information about ROTC and the Army but not as much knowledge as cadets. There were relatively few significant differences between males and females or among the three ethnic groups on a knowledge test. Relatively more cadets became aware of ROTC from other people while relatively more non-ROTC students became aware from television and radio or newspapers and magazine advertisements. Relatively more black cadets became aware of ROTC from media ads.

A higher proportion of cadets than students reported that people were influential on their decision to join ROTC while relatively more non-ROTC students reported that their personal beliefs and career goals were influential on their decision not to join. There were very few significant sex or ethnic background differences in these influences.

Cadets and non-ROTC students agreed on the most attractive and least attractive aspects of the Army as an institution, but the cadets provided significantly higher ratings than the generally negative non-ROTC student ratings. Again, females and Hispanics provided the highest ratings.

A higher proportion of cadets than non-ROTC students, and more males than females, felt an unconditional duty to serve in the military, or a duty to serve if needed.

The majority of cadets decided to join ROTC in high school and a much higher percentage of males than females intended to continue through the Advanced Course. There was no clear pattern either in the type of Army service planned or in the intended length of service by cadets. About 20% planned for Regular Army duty and 14% planned to serve more than five years beyond their obligated duty period. Sex and ethnic background tended not to distinguish the cadets from each other in terms of post-college Army-related plans.

Utilization of Findings

Cadets and students hold different views of the attractiveness of an Army career that may be tempered by a student personal value set negative to the military. It is an open question whether this value set can or should be changed by media advertising. When students are willing to seriously consider an Army officer career, recruiting messages pointing out

the match between the Army and their specific job concerns and career goals should be effective. Media presentations probably serve best to make students aware of ROTC rather than to convince them to join. Recruiting campaigns using personal contacts, with the media serving a secondary awareness role, should be considered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In January 1979 our three-person staff was assigned a challenging task: to administer a 232-item questionnaire to 720 college students at 13 campuses across the country, and then analyze and report survey data by the first of May. This report reflects the extent to which that challenge has been met. It could not have been produced without the dedication of the project staff, the encouragement of the project sponsors, and the cooperation of the Professors of Military Science and survey respondents at participating colleges.

The Project Staff

Most of the work associated with this research effort was carried out by Drs. T. R. Armstrong and W. S. Farrell. Dr. Armstrong directed the data collection effort. He made all the arrangements for collection of survey data and visited six of the thirteen survey sites to help ensure the quality of data received. Dr. Armstrong also produced the first draft of this report. Dr. Farrell directed the data processing effort. He wrote all the computer programs required to analyze the survey data. He was also responsible for the accuracy of the data tables contained in this report. Ms. Pat Spurr supervised the clarification of survey answer sheets, the tallying of the open-ended media usage items, and the typing of this manuscript. Dr. J. J. Carr served as manager and consultant on the project, and edited the draft version of this report produced by the project staff.

The Project Sponsors

The project was sponsored by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) and the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI). Colonel William L. McKay and Miss Terry Collins of TRADOC, and Mr. Anthony Castelnovo and Dr. Jack Hicks of ARI were especially supportive and helpful throughout the study.

The Data Collection Coordinators

The Professor of Military Science and a designated associate at each college campus were the keys that made the data collection possible. Thanks go to:

Canisius College
LTC Robert L. Rackley
Major Samuel A. Biank

Eastern New Mexico University
LTC Peter P. McKenzie
Captain Emilio Rodriguez

Idaho State University
LTC Douglass S. Detlie
Captain Melecio R. Rodriguez

Jackson State University
Colonel Tom Adams, Jr.
Major Whiddon

Marquette University
LTC George T. Talbot
Captain Richard J. Arndt

Michigan State University
LTC Robert J. Schiemann
Captain Hugh R. Dittmore

St. Mary's University of
San Antonio
LTC Ruben A. Candia
Captain Dan Goodman

Texas Tech University
LTC Clayton S. Roberson
Captain B. B. Bell

University of Miami
Colonel William T. McElrath
Major Smith

West Virginia University
LTC Roger D. Harms
Captain Kenneth R. Vreeland, Jr.

Texas A & I University
Colonel Don E. Karr

University of California, Los Angeles
LTC Peter A. Gray
Major Eric K. Azuma

University of Texas at El Paso
LTC Donald A. Schmidt
Captain Montez

The Survey Respondents

Finally, thanks are due to the anonymous survey respondents who took the time to complete the lengthy survey questionnaire. This project could not have been conducted without their cooperation.

American Institutes for Research
April 1979

J.J. Card, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. METHOD	4
CHAPTER 3. RESULTS	13
CHAPTER 4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	71

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Numbers and Stratification of the College and University Sample	5
2	Potential Colleges and Universities Drawn for Each Sample Stratum	7
3	Targeted College Student Sample Size	8
4	Distribution of College Student Respondents	10
5	Distribution of Respondents Employed in Data Analyses	11
6	Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents	14
7	Military Experience and Attitudes of Family and Friends	15
8	Media Preferences	17
9	Rank Order of "Other" Magazines Read Occasionally or Regularly	20
10	Education-Related Variables	21
11	Career-Related Variables	23
12	Knowledge of ROTC and the Army	27
13	Variables Relating to the Army and ROTC	30
14	Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents	36
15	Military Experience and Attitudes of Family and Friends	38
16	Media Preferences	39
17	Rank Ordering of Media Categories Attended to Occasionally or Regularly: ROTC Cadets	42
18	Rank Ordering of Media Categories Attended to Occasionally or Regularly: Non-ROTC Students	43
19	Rank Ordering of Magazines Read Occasionally or Regularly: ROTC Cadets	44
20	Rank Ordering of Magazines Read Occasionally or Regularly: Non-ROTC Students	45
21	Rank Order of Favorite Television Programs: ROTC Cadets	46
22	Rank Order of Favorite Television Programs: Non-ROTC Students	47
23	Rank Order of Favorite Radio Programming: ROTC Cadets	48
24	Rank Order of Favorite Radio Programming: Non-ROTC Students	48
25	Education-Related Variables	50
26	Career-Related Variables	52

LIST OF TABLES, continued

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
27	Rank Ordering of the Three Most and Three Least Important Job Dimensions and the Three Dimensions Most and Least Expected to be Satisfied in the Army	57
28	Knowledge of ROTC and the Army	58
29	Variables Relating to the Army and ROTC	62
30	ROTC Cadets: Military Career Plans and Alternatives	66
31	ROTC Cadets: Commitment-Related Attitudes	69

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Objectives

The survey described in this report was conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) in January-March 1979 for the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) and the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. The mandate of the research effort was to identify the current values and attitudes of various sex and ethnic subgroups of college students in order to: (a) provide input to TRADOC's national advertising and recruiting campaign for the U.S. Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program, and (b) provide information to the ROTC regional commands and Professors of Military Science (PMSs) across the country for use in regional and local recruitment and selection efforts.

Background

The survey follows several others with a similar mandate. To give perspective to the findings to be reported, a brief summary of previous work is first provided.

Ayer and Yankelovich, 1971.¹ The Ayer advertising agency, with the assistance of the Yankelovich survey firm, conducted a survey in the fall of 1971, not too long after the lottery system was introduced into the draft. The conclusions drawn from that survey were that male high school seniors and male college sophomores (half in ROTC) could be divided into four groups on the basis of their attitudes toward ROTC and military service. About 11% of the high school seniors, 2% of the non-ROTC college sophomores, and 50% of the ROTC sophomores were classed as patriots--those who felt a distinct obligation to serve in the military. At the other extreme, 18% of the high school seniors and 37% of the non-ROTC college sophomores were classed as antimilitary--those who felt strongly negative toward military service and would take action to avoid serving; none of the cadets fell into this category. The rest of the survey respondents were classified as rational thinkers or wishful thinkers. Rational thinkers would serve in the military if called upon, despite their particular attitudes, but would shop around for the best overall deal. Wishful thinkers were inclined to believe that something would happen to preclude their having to serve, but would go if called. The striking result is that fully half of the ROTC group were classified as patriots in marked contrast to the other groups. The ROTC patriot group tended to be from white, middle-income families in the Midwest. They thought of themselves as politically conservative and had given a great deal of thought to their intended military service. They tended to be quite different from all of the other groups on many of the dimensions treated in the survey.

-
1. Ayer, H. W., and Son, Inc., and Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. An investigation of ROTC among college and high school students. March 1972.

Virginia Polytechnic, 1973.² A second survey was conducted by a research team from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in the fall of 1973, shortly after the abolition of the draft. Consistent with the Ayer and Yankelovich study, this survey found ROTC cadets to be a relatively homogeneous group--predominantly conservative, white, from middle-class backgrounds, and from families with military experience. They had given considerable thought to their choice of career and had joined ROTC for positive reasons, many of which were not shared with non-ROTC college students.

American Institutes for Research, 1975.³ AIR conducted a survey in the spring of 1975 that was aimed primarily at developing and testing a model of career commitment in the young adult years, but that also assessed the attitudes of high school seniors and college students toward ROTC and the Army. The major findings of the project were:

1. Participants in ROTC differ, often strikingly, from nonparticipant college students in aptitudes, values, salient attitudes, and dimensions sought in a job.
2. The differences between ROTC participants and nonparticipants increase with time, as they go through college.
3. Different career influences become salient at different times as cadets and students go through college.
4. Early exposure to a career path, like the ROTC program leading to a career as an officer, increases subsequent participation in and commitment to the career.
5. The more intrinsic or free one's initial motivation in exploring a career path like ROTC, the greater the likelihood of subsequent commitment to the path.
6. College-stage experiences with a career path like ROTC influence commitment to the career indirectly, by causing an individual to have high expectations about the post-college career stage. Post-college career-stage experiences influence commitment directly.
7. Experiences affect commitment to a career more strongly than expectations.
8. The career commitment process is different for different ethnic subgroups of the general college population.

-
2. Montgomery, J. R., McLaughlin, G. W., Pedigo, B. A., Mahan, B. T., and Associates. Field test of a survey of attitudes toward AROTC from students in high school, college, and AROTC. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, March 1974.
 3. Card, J. J., Goodstadt, B. E., Gross, D. E., and Shanner, W. M. Development of a ROTC/Army career commitment model. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1975.

Gilbert Youth Research, 1977.⁴ Finally, Gilbert Youth Research, Inc., conducted the most recent similar survey in 1977, with the findings reported by ARI in 1979. The results of this survey fit the pattern established by earlier research. ROTC cadets held more positive attitudes about military service than did non-ROTC college students. Cadets were also more likely to feel that their families and friends thought positively about military service. Further, parents and military personnel were the strongest influences on cadets joining the ROTC program in college. While this survey found that ROTC cadets were predominantly male as had earlier research, a changing pattern in some of the demographic characteristics of cadets was found. Increasing numbers of black students from lower-income families in the South were found to be joining ROTC, which traditionally had been composed of white, conservative, middle-class male students.

The present study draws upon the earlier research and continues to identify the values and attitudes of college youth toward ROTC and the Army.

-
4. Hicks, J. M., Collins, T., and Weldon, J. I. Youth aspirations and perceptions of ROTC/Military: A comparison. Washington, DC: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, April 1979.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

This chapter will describe various methodological aspects of the present study, including: the survey questionnaire, sampling procedures, survey respondents, and quality control procedures.

The Survey Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire was drafted by staff from the Advertising/Media Division of TRADOC and then refined by AIR. The ROTC/Army career commitment model developed by AIR in 1975 was used to guide questionnaire construction. Two hundred thirty-two items measuring the following variable sets were included in the questionnaire: background and primary socialization variables; aptitudes and achievement; secondary socialization conditions such as school experiences; values, interests, and aspirations; information about ROTC and the Army; perceived costs and rewards of joining ROTC; college and ROTC program experiences; and perceived costs and rewards of an Army officer career. In addition, TRADOC included some new items relating to the media usage habits of college students.

AIR conducted a pretest of the instrument to correct any problems with item wording and questionnaire length, and to create response categories for open-ended items, in order that these could be rewritten as structured items processable by computer. The pretest was conducted with ROTC cadets and non-ROTC students at the University of San Francisco and the University of Santa Clara. Pretest respondents completed the questionnaire under actual test conditions. Following this, they were queried verbally about problems they encountered in answering the questionnaire. A final version of the questionnaire was then prepared by AIR on the basis of pretest results. This version was reviewed and approved by TRADOC and the Army Research Institute.

Sampling Procedures

Sampling was conducted in two rounds: first, school sampling: a stratified random sample of eight schools representative of the college campuses having an ROTC program was drawn; second, student sampling within school: a stratified random sample of college freshmen and sophomores attending the selected schools was chosen.

The school sample was stratified by size of school (fewer than or greater than 12,000 undergraduates) and by ROTC region in which the school was located (1, 2, 3, or 4). Table 1 gives the school sampling arrangement.

The Closing Enrollment Report for the School Year 1977-78⁵ was used to classify the 276 colleges and universities with an Army ROTC program by

5. Headquarters U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. Army ROTC and NDCC Closing Enrollment Report, School Year 1977-1978. Ft. Monroe, VA, August 1978.

Table 1

Numbers and Stratification of the College
and University Sample

ROTC Region	Size	
	Small/Medium ^a	Large ^b
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1

^a Fewer than 12,000 undergraduates

^b More than 12,000 undergraduates

size and ROTC region. Within each cell in Table 1, three random choices of schools were made to allow some flexibility in the final selection. The potential school sample is presented in Table 2.

From this potential sample, TRADOC and the Army Research Institute selected eight "first choice" schools: The University of Pennsylvania, West Virginia University, Marquette University, Michigan State University, Jackson State University, Texas Tech University, Idaho State University, and the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).

The PMSs at these eight schools agreed to solicit the participation of their cadets and to help make arrangements for data collection from non-ROTC students. Arrangements were completed satisfactorily at seven of the eight schools. At the University of Pennsylvania, delays in obtaining permission to survey non-cadet students were experienced. Because of time constraints on the research effort, this school was replaced by another medium-sized school from ROTC Region 1: Canisius College.

The target population at the selected schools was college freshmen and sophomores representative of subgroups varying in ROTC membership, sex, and racial or ethnic background (black, Hispanic, white). To ensure that survey findings would be reliable and valid, a minimum goal of 60 respondents for each of the subgroups of interest was established, per the distribution presented in Table 3.

An analysis of ROTC enrollment data for the closing of the 1977-78 school year revealed that the eight schools selected for participation could not possibly provide the desired numbers of Hispanic respondents: only six Hispanic males and no Hispanic females were then participating in ROTC at the selected schools. A special sample of the five colleges with the greatest numbers of freshman and sophomore Hispanic cadets was therefore added to the study: Eastern New Mexico University, St. Mary's University of San Antonio, Texas A & I University, University of Miami, and University of Texas at El Paso. A total of 13 schools thus participated in the study.

Cadet participants at each of the 13 schools consisted of students enrolled in MS I or MS II classes (the ROTC Basic Course). Non-cadet participants were generally obtained from mandatory freshman or sophomore classes such as English.

The survey questionnaire was administered either by an AIR staff member or by a university staff member who had been briefed in detail by AIR about the background, instructions, and materials for the survey. In one case, the non-ROTC students were surveyed by mail direct from AIR using a mailing list generated by the university administration.

The Survey Respondents

Questionnaire answer sheets from 1,055 respondents were received and processed by project staff. Fourteen of these were rejected during the coding process as they were either largely incomplete or obviously had been answered haphazardly. Questionnaire answer sheets from the remaining 1,041

Table 2

Potential Colleges and Universities Drawn
for Each Sample Stratum

ROTC Region	Potential Representatives	
	Small/Medium Colleges	Large Colleges
1	Florida Institute of Technology University of Pennsylvania Canisius College	Temple University University of Pittsburgh West Virginia University
2	University of Toledo Marquette University Southwest Missouri State University	Michigan State University Northern Illinois Univer- sity University of Tennessee
3	Kansas State University Jackson State University Texas Christian University	Texas Tech University University of Kansas Auburn University
4	Idaho State University University of Nevada Seattle University	University of Colorado Washington State Univer- sity University of California at Los Angeles

Table 3
Targeted College Student Sample Size

Ethnic Background and Sex	Status		Total
	ROTC	Non-ROTC	
Black			
Male	60	60	120
Female	60	60	120
Hispanic			
Male	60	60	120
Female	60	60	120
White			
Male	60	60	120
Female	60	60	120
Total	360	360	720

respondents were keypunched, verified, and entered into computer files. Table 4 presents the distribution of these respondents.

The first processing step was to identify the respondents according to status in ROTC (MS I & II vs MS III & IV) and status in college (freshman and sophomore vs other). This analysis revealed that 86 of the 548 ROTC cadets were in the Advanced Course (MS III and IV), and that 82 of the 493 non-ROTC respondents were other than freshmen or sophomores. Since there is some evidence to indicate that cadets who have signed a contract and entered the ROTC Advanced Course may hold attitudes, beliefs, and intentions more narrowly defined than cadets in the Basic Course, it was decided to drop these individuals from further analyses. The few cadets and non-ROTC students who identified their status in college as other than freshman or sophomore were retained in all analyses since there is no evidence of a sharp break in their characteristics from those of freshmen and sophomores only. The primary concern with the ethnic backgrounds of the respondents was to determine if there were differences between blacks, Hispanics, and whites on the variables of interest. Accordingly, all respondents who identified their racial/ethnic background as other than black, Hispanic, or white were eliminated from further analysis. The final set of respondents retained after elimination of MS III and IV cadets and of individuals of "other" ethnic backgrounds is shown in Table 5. All analyses presented and discussed in this report are based on data obtained from the 931 respondents displayed in Table 5.

The distribution of respondents shown in the table differs somewhat from the target samples presented in Table 3 and reflects the realities of the ethnic composition of the 13 universities in the survey. Although the target value was not reached for certain categories, an adequate number of responses was obtained to warrant further processing and meaningful analyses. As results are discussed, it should be kept in mind that the black respondents came primarily from one campus, the Hispanic respondents from five campuses, and the white respondents from 12 different campuses.

Quality Control Procedures

Rigorous measures were undertaken to assess and assure the quality of processed data.

Elimination of unacceptable answer sheets. As previously mentioned, 14 of the 1,055 answer sheets received (1.4%) were eliminated from further processing because respondents either: (a) failed to answer at least three of the four main sections of the questionnaire, or (b) failed to pass visual haphazard answering checks made by two staff members. These checks were: an "out-of-range" check, which revealed whether the respondent was providing answers in the acceptable range for each question; a "repeat" check, which revealed whether respondents were providing different first, second and third choices to two sets of items; and a "response set" check, which revealed implausible patterns in answer values (e.g., complete absence of variance) that would indicate that the respondent was not taking the survey seriously.

Table 4

Distribution of College Student Respondents

Ethnic Background and Sex	Status		Total
	ROTC	Non-ROTC	
Black			
Male	83	24	107
Female	69	32	101
Hispanic			
Male	46	57	103
Female	33	53	86
White			
Male	202	173	375
Female	85	131	216
Other			
Male	26	15	41
Female	4	8	12
Total	548	493	1041

Table 5

Distribution of Respondents
Employed in Data Analyses

Ethnic Background and Sex	Status		Total
	ROTC	Non-ROTC	
Black			
Male	74	24	98
Female	69	32	101
Hispanic			
Male	40	57	97
Female	31	53	84
White			
Male	170	173	343
Female	77	131	208
Total	461	470	931

Editing and clarification of acceptable answer sheets. Further checks were conducted on the 1,041 cases which passed the first screening. First, each blank on an answer sheet was scanned to determine whether an answer was provided, and if so, whether it was readily legible. Missing answer values were supplied an appropriate code, and hard-to-read answer numbers were made legible. Written answers or others in an inappropriate format were interpreted and coded whenever possible. A missing answer code was supplied for completely illegible or uninterpretable answers.

Check on the accuracy of data keypunching. Subsequent to keypunching of the clarified answer sheets, computer data from a random set of 35 respondents were proofed against source answer sheets. In addition, computer checks for out-of-range values on each variable were run. The keypunching job was found to be excellent. An error rate less than half of the maximum acceptable rate of .2% was obtained. All detected errors were corrected prior to data analysis.

Evaluation of the quality of the final data base. Because of reasons already discussed, the 110 respondents who were outside the population of interest (either enrolled in the ROTC Advanced Course or of ethnic background other than black, Hispanic, or white) were dropped from the data base. Several inconsistency checks were then run by means of computer algorithms to assess the quality of the final data base of 931 respondents. These tests revealed that cadets and students were being generally consistent in their answers, so that no major qualifications on the findings of the survey are warranted. Deviations from consistency were as follows: Nine percent of respondents reported that a Junior ROTC program was available in their high school but did not rate this program when asked to do so; three percent of respondents reported that there was no Junior ROTC program in the high school they attended, but proceeded to rate various aspects of Junior ROTC. Some caution should thus be exercised in interpreting these ratings. Eight percent of respondents reported that they were currently a member of college ROTC but did not answer the "Cadet Only" portion of the questionnaire. Ten percent of respondents reported that they were currently a member of college ROTC but answered the "Non-Cadet Only" questions. These last two problems were possibly attributable to misunderstanding by some respondents of the term "cadet." At some of the ROTC detachments surveyed, the term is used only in reference to those students who have signed a contract and are enrolled in the ROTC Advanced Course. It should be noted that possible misclassification of some respondents as cadets or non-cadets adds "noise" to the data, demanding greater cadet versus non-cadet differences before these reach statistical significance. Thus the possible error is in the conservative direction and there is no reason to mistrust obtained significant findings. In general, the results of the inconsistency tests were encouraging, and no respondents were dropped from further data analysis on the basis of these tests.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The results of the survey are presented in three major sections. The first section presents values of the survey variables for the ROTC cadets as a group versus the non-ROTC students as a group and assesses the significance of obtained group differences. The section is organized by topic area, ranging from a demographic profile of the respondents to variables relating to the Army and ROTC. The second section presents values of the survey variables for females and males separately, and for blacks, Hispanics, and whites separately. The breakdowns are presented for both ROTC cadets and for non-ROTC students, following the same topical organization as the first section. Significant differences between the sex and ethnic subgroups of interest are identified and discussed. The third section presents the data from ROTC cadets on the "Cadets Only" portion of the survey questionnaire. Breakdowns between females and males, and among blacks, Hispanics, and whites are displayed and discussed.

Before describing these findings, one point must be made to put them in perspective: In a study with a sample size as large as the present one, some minor relationships with little substantive significance may reach statistical significance at the .05 level. Some of these findings are discussed in the text for the sake of completeness and for their heuristic significance, but their importance to the career participation and commitment process should be interpreted with caution unless they replicate or will be replicated by other studies. Findings significant at the .01 and .001 levels are obviously on much stronger ground.

Section 1. ROTC Cadet/Non-ROTC Student Differences

Demographic Profile

A demographic profile of the respondents is presented in Table 6. Because the sample was stratified on the variables of Sex, Ethnic Background, and Region of Socialization, the statistical significance of cadet vs student differences on these variables was not assessed. The size of the community in which respondents grew up was somewhat constrained by the choice of the particular 13 colleges in the sample, but it is interesting to note that overall there were no significant differences between cadets and students: cadets were no more likely to be from a small or large community than were students. Students reported significantly greater parental yearly income than did cadets, but both means were in the \$20,500-\$23,000 per year range.

Military-Related Background

The next cluster of variables examined was the military-related background of the respondents. Such a background contributes to the socialization of an individual, and can be important in helping to shape future career plans. Table 7 presents the data on relatives who were ever in ROTC or the military, and on friends' and parents' ratings of an Army officer career. The cadet values were consistently higher than the student values, although

Table 6
Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents

Demographic Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Sex</u>			
% Female	38.4	46.0	NA ^a
% Male	61.6	54.0	
<u>Ethnic Background</u>			
% Black	31.0	11.9	NA ^a
% Hispanic	15.4	23.4	
% White	53.6	64.7	
<u>Mean, Age of Respondents</u>	19.15	19.65	t(926)=-4.61***
<u>Region of Socialization</u> ^b			
% East	9.9	12.8	NA ^a
% Midwest	11.0	17.7	
% West	10.7	17.1	
% South	60.3	48.4	
% Outside U.S.	2.6	1.9	
% Several Regions	5.5	2.1	
<u>Type of Community in Which Grew Up</u>			$\chi^2(4)=NS$
% Rural	11.7	13.5	
% Small City/Town	35.2	33.8	
% Medium City	20.0	20.7	
% Suburb	13.9	14.3	
% Large City	19.1	17.7	
<u>Mean, Parents' Annual Income</u> ^c	4.58	5.11	t(906)=-3.27***

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 and t were evaluated.

^a Significance tests were not performed for differences in Sex, Ethnic Background, or Region of Socialization because the sample was stratified on these variables.

^b Region of Socialization was derived from the following questionnaire item, "Where did you spend the majority of your elementary and high school years?"

- East: 1. New England (Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont)
- 2. Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania)
- Midwest: 3. East North Central (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin)
- 4. West North Central (Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas)
- West: 5. Mountain (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada)
- 6. Pacific (Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii)
- South: 7. South Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida)
- 8. East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi)
- 9. West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)
- Outside U.S.: 10. Didn't grow up in the United States
- Several Regions: 11. Moved around too much to consider myself from any one region

^c 1 = Under \$5,000; 4 = \$15,000 to \$19,999; 5 = \$20,000 to \$24,999; 9 = Over \$40,000

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 7

Military Experience and Attitudes of Family and Friends

Military Socialization Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Relatives in ROTC</u>			
% with Parents ever in ROTC	17.0	15.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Siblings ever in ROTC	19.7	15.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Cousins ever in ROTC	27.6	23.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Aunts or Uncles ever in ROTC	25.9	18.2	$\chi^2(1)=7.48^{**}$
% with Grandparents ever in ROTC	9.2	5.6	$\chi^2(1)=3.97^{*}$
% with Friends ever in ROTC	60.6	50.3	$\chi^2(1)=9.49^{**}$
<u>Relatives in the Military</u>			
% with Parents ever in Military	59.1	54.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Siblings ever in Military	24.0	17.7	$\chi^2(1)=5.16^{*}$
% with Cousins ever in Military	54.4	48.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Aunts or Uncles ever in Military	67.8	64.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Grandparents ever in Military	35.9	30.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% with Friends ever in Military	76.8	64.7	$\chi^2(1)=15.84^{***}$
<u>Mean, Friends' Rating of an Army Officer Career^a</u>	3.28	2.86	$t(928)=6.15^{***}$
<u>Mean, Parents' Rating of an Army Officer Career^a</u>	3.90	3.37	$t(928)=8.21^{***}$

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 and t were evaluated.

^a 1 = Very Low Status; 5 = Very High Status

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

not all the differences were statistically significant. A significantly higher percentage of cadets than students reported having aunts or uncles, grandparents, and friends in ROTC; the same was true concerning brothers or sisters and friends in the military. Cadets also reported thinking that their friends and parents would rate an Army officer career significantly more favorably than did students. Both cadets and students attributed significantly more favorable ratings of an Army officer career to their parents, as opposed to their friends ($t = 9.31$ and 6.74 respectively, $p < .001$). Of the four sets of ratings, only the mean of students' estimate of their friends' rating fell below the mid-point of the scale (indicating a somewhat negative opinion of an Army officer career).

Media Preferences

The media preferences of the respondents were surveyed to identify those types most preferred in general, and to seek out differences between cadets' and students' preferences. Respondents were also presented with a list of 39 magazine titles and asked to rate how often they read each one. They were then asked to list any other magazines that they read occasionally or regularly, to list their favorite television programs, and to indicate their favorite type of radio programming. The last three items required the respondents to write in their choices on the answer sheet. Detailed tallies of answers to the open-ended items concerning preferred television and radio programs are discussed in Section 2. Table 8 presents the data concerning media categories preferred and the ratings of the 39 listed magazines.

Cadets and students had the same rank ordering of media usage habits: newspapers first, followed by (in descending order of frequency) radio, television, general magazines, and sports/outdoor magazines. Over 60% of cadets and students reported attending to each of these media categories occasionally or regularly. Only two significant differences between cadets and students on types of media preferred were found: relatively more cadets than students reported that they occasionally or regularly read business/trade magazines and mechanics/science magazines.

The list of specific magazines presented in Table 8 shows a wide range of readership, ranging from about half the respondents who occasionally or regularly read Time and Newsweek to very few who read Wassaja, Delegate, or Navaho Times. When the respondents are taken as a single group, the data show that the category of "General Magazines" has the most regular readership of all magazine types. Of the eight listed magazines occasionally or regularly read by 30% or more of the respondents, seven--Newsweek, Time, U.S. News and World Report, TV Guide, People, National Geographic, and Reader's Digest--were in the general category, and only Sports Illustrated came from another area.

A striking pattern throughout the list is that relatively more ROTC cadets than students reported reading 34 of the 39 magazines; 16 of these differences were statistically significant. Cosmopolitan was the only magazine for which a significantly higher percentage of students than cadets reported occasional or regular reading.

Table 8
Media Preferences

Media Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Percent Who Attend to Various Media Categories Occasionally or Regularly</u>			
Business/Trade Magazines	36.5	28.8	$\chi^2(1)=5.56^*$
Sports/Outdoor Magazines	63.2	61.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Mechanics/Science Magazines	33.1	22.4	$\chi^2(1)=11.67^{***}$
Automotive Magazines	19.2	17.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Men's Magazines	34.6	31.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Women's Magazines	25.1	29.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Home Service Magazines	28.7	31.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
General Magazines	68.3	62.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Newspapers	77.4	79.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Sunday Supplements	53.4	51.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Television	71.8	62.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Radio	76.1	68.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Billboards	53.2	49.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
<u>Percent Who Read Various Magazines Occasionally or Regularly</u>			
Exploring	7.8	4.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Senior Scholastic	11.1	6.9	$\chi^2(1)=4.38^*$
Campus Life	16.0	12.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Newsweek	52.5	47.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Time	58.6	49.2	$\chi^2(1)=6.05^*$
US News & World Report	34.1	23.7	$\chi^2(1)=10.55^{**}$
Ebony	14.1	5.7	$\chi^2(1)=15.39^{***}$
Sports Illustrated	47.6	40.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
TV Guide	43.1	42.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Crisis	4.4	2.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Nutshell	4.0	3.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Field & Stream	18.6	11.8	$\chi^2(1)=7.59^{**}$
Popular Mechanics	17.7	9.8	$\chi^2(1)=11.17^{***}$
Career World	11.7	5.7	$\chi^2(1)=9.77^{**}$
College Outlook	12.7	6.7	$\chi^2(1)=8.68^{**}$
People	34.8	38.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Jet	9.5	4.5	$\chi^2(1)=7.06^{**}$
Black Sports	9.0	3.5	$\chi^2(1)=10.22^{**}$
Dawn	3.3	1.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Sport	17.7	15.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Wheels	5.3	4.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
National Future Farmer	2.9	2.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Mechanix Illustrated	11.6	6.4	$\chi^2(1)=6.85^{**}$
Road & Track	11.8	11.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
18 Almanac	3.5	2.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Black Collegian	5.8	2.8	$\chi^2(1)=4.43^*$

Table 8, continued

Media Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Percent Who Read Various Magazines Occasionally or Regularly (cont.)</u>			
Wassaja	0.2	0.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Deleg.te	1.5	0.0	$\chi^2(1)=5.30^*$
Black Enterprise	7.7	3.2	$\chi^2(1)=8.09^{**}$
Nuestro	2.0	2.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Navaho Times	1.1	0.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Cosmopolitan	11.7	18.0	$\chi^2(1)=6.03^*$
Car & Driver	12.6	10.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Popular Science	21.7	13.2	$\chi^2(1)=10.82^{***}$
Popular Photography	11.8	9.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
National Geographic	33.1	31.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Stereo Review	11.3	7.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Reader's Digest	50.8	39.3	$\chi^2(1)=9.68^{**}$
Reader's Digest (Spanish)	2.4	2.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$

Note.

The number in parentheses following the χ^2 statistic is the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 was evaluated.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Respondents were asked whether there were any magazines other than the 39 in the provided list which they read occasionally or regularly. Over 450 different titles were written in, some of which were journals, newspapers, or other periodicals. The majority of the titles were listed by only one or two respondents. Table 9 lists the 18 different magazines that were written in by 2% or more of the ROTC cadet or the non-ROTC student groups. Five out of the 13 magazines on the cadets' top write-in list and six of the 11 magazines on the students' list were in the women's magazine category.

Education-Related Variables

Data on education-related variables--including year in school, college major, sources of college finance, school grades, extracurricular activities, and influences on educational plans--are presented in Table 10.

The cadet and student samples were both stratified by year in school; thus they were composed of somewhat similar percentages of freshmen and sophomores. However, the student sample had more individuals in the "other" (than freshman or sophomore) category, primarily because cadets in the Advanced Course were eliminated from the study sample. The 7.4% of cadets in the "other" category were all enrolled in the ROTC Basic Course.

Significant differences in the college major of cadets and students were found. Relatively more cadets than students were majoring in a biological science or engineering, and relatively more students than cadets were majoring in a social science, education, or agriculture. Fewer than two percentage points separated the cadets from students on all other choices. The difference in the numbers of agriculture majors may reflect the perception that the military does not offer an opportunity to make use of knowledge and skills in this area, and thus students with a serious agriculture orientation do not join ROTC.

With the exception of the fact that a significantly greater proportion of cadets than students held an ROTC scholarship as expected, there were no meaningful differences in the sources the respondents were using to finance their college education. The seven non-ROTC students who reported having an ROTC scholarship may have been misclassified on the basis of their own self-reports.

Cadets and students reported no meaningful differences in their high school or college grade point averages, or in the extent of their participation in high school extracurricular activities. In short, except for their choice of college major, cadets and other college students were very much alike on most of the education-related variables.

The two groups did show some interesting differences in their reports of the influences on their educational and career plans. Both groups rated mother followed by father as having the greatest influence on these plans. However, cadets rated the influence of relatives (other than parents), counselors, and individuals in the career significantly higher than did students. These differences imply that cadets value the opinion of people beyond the immediate family to a greater extent than students do. Such openness to educational and career information from a variety of sources may be an indication of greater career maturity on the part of cadets.

Table 9

Rank Order of "Other" Magazines Read Occasionally or Regularly^a

ROTC Cadets (n=461)		Non-ROTC Students (n=470)	
Magazine	% of Group	Magazine	% of Group
Playboy	11.9	Playboy	14.7
Glamour	6.5	Glamour	10.6
Penthouse	6.5	Seventeen	8.1
Seventeen	6.5	Penthouse	5.1
Essence	3.7	Mademoiselle	4.3
Soldier of Fortune	3.4	Vogue	3.6
Redbook	2.4	Life	3.2
McCalls	2.2	Redbook	3.0
National Lampoon	2.2	Playgirl	2.1
American Rifleman	2.0	Psychology Today	2.1
Guns and Ammo	2.0	Rolling Stone	2.1
Hot Rod	2.0		
Rolling Stone	2.0		

^a Magazines listed by fewer than 2% of either the cadets or the students are not included in this table.

Table 10
Education-Related Variables

Education Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Year in School</u>			
% Freshmen	49.9	43.4	NA ^a
% Sophomores	42.7	40.2	
% Other	7.4	16.4	
<u>College Major</u>			
% Physical Science	2.5	2.6	$\chi^2(13)=29.13^{**}$
% Biological Science	13.3	8.7	
% Social Science	10.0	14.3	
% English and Literature	0.7	1.5	
% Education	3.5	6.0	
% Fine Arts	2.6	3.4	
% Foreign Language	0.4	0.9	
% Engineering	12.0	7.0	
% Mathematics	1.5	1.7	
% Agriculture	0.7	3.2	
% Physical Education	2.8	2.8	
% Business	24.6	23.7	
% Other	21.4	20.0	
% Don't know	3.1	4.3	
<u>Sources of College Finance</u>			
% Family	64.2	68.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Scholarship, ROTC	11.4	1.5	$\chi^2(1)=36.30^{***}$
% Scholarship, Other	36.1	37.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Work	53.6	57.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
<u>Mean, High School Grade Average^b</u>	4.02	4.10	$t(927)=NS$
<u>Mean, College Grade Average^b</u>	3.59	3.59	$t(878)=NS$
<u>High School Extracurricular Activities</u>			$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% No Activities	10.2	13.1	
% One Activity	16.3	16.1	
% More than One Activity	73.4	70.9	
<u>Mean, Influence on Educational and Career Plans Provided by^c</u>			
Father	3.31	3.43	$t(921)=NS$
Mother	3.68	3.61	$t(925)=NS$
Other Relatives	2.55	2.31	$t(925)=2.88^{**}$
Friends	2.48	2.56	$t(926)=NS$
Teachers	2.75	2.60	$t(926)=NS$
Counselors	2.31	2.14	$t(925)=2.13^*$
Those in the Career	2.92	2.68	$t(925)=2.83^{**}$

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 and t were evaluated.

^a A significance test was not performed for differences in Year in School because the sample was stratified on this variable.

^b 1 = Lower than D; 2 = D; 3 = C; 4 = B, 5 = A

^c 1 = Very Small Role, 5 = Very Large Role

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Career-Related Variables

A very large group of career-related variables is presented in Table 11, and some interesting patterns emerge. Cadets and students on the average reported that they would like to be earning about \$29,000 per year 10 years after college (presumably in 1979 dollars). This represents about a \$6,000 increase over what they estimate their parents' income to be.

The careers being considered by the cadets and students indicate that this salary goal is realistic. When the first choice of a career area in Table 11 is examined, several significant differences between cadets and students appear. Relatively more cadets than students picked the area of engineering, physical science, mathematics, and architecture, and the area of military officer as their first career choice. It is interesting that only 15.8% of the MS I and MS II cadets surveyed reported that military officer was their first career choice. The indication is that the majority of the cadets have joined ROTC for reasons other than the definite desire to establish themselves in a military career. Relatively more students than cadets selected business administration, general teaching and social service, and humanities, law, social and behavioral sciences as their first career choice. The significant difference in the preference for a career in business administration is somewhat surprising, since about equal percentages of cadets and students were business majors. Very few of the respondents picked housewife as their first career.

The next section of Table 11 presents the percentage of the cadets or students who picked each career area as their first, second, or third choice. When second and third career choices are added to the first, one of the significant differences between cadets and students disappears (percent considering engineering, physical science, mathematics, and architecture) but two new ones appear. A significantly higher percentage of students than cadets then reported that they were considering the proprietors and sales area, and housewife. These differences were not significant when first career choice alone was examined. In the former case, the difference may indicate that students, more than cadets, view owning their own business or working in sales as a fall-back if they are not successful in their first career choice. In the latter case, the difference may indicate that female cadets are more serious than female students about having an independent career. The category showing the greatest increase when second and third career choices are added to the first is the percentage of cadets considering becoming military officers. Over 35% of the cadets picked this career as their second or third choice. These data imply that although few cadets are definite in wanting to become a career officer, as indicated by first choice alone, a significant proportion are entertaining the idea, as indicated by the increase.

The last two sections of Table 11 present a list of job dimensions shown by prior research to be components of job satisfaction. Respondents were asked first to rate each dimension for how important it was to them, and then to imagine they were an Army officer and rate the dimension for potential for satisfaction in the Army. The importance ratings assigned by students, and especially by cadets, were uniformly high. The cadet average rating was significantly higher than the student average for six of the 21

Table 11
Career-Related Variables

Career Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Mean, Expected Annual Salary 10 Years After College^a</u>	5.33	5.23	t(918)=NS
<u>Careers Being Considered: First Choice</u>			
% Engineering, Physical Science, Mathematics, Architecture	16.3	11.1	$\chi^2(1)=4.92^*$
% Medical and Biological Sciences	16.7	14.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Business Administration	15.0	23.2	$\chi^2(1)=9.65^{**}$
% General Teaching and Social Service	3.9	9.8	$\chi^2(1)=11.68^{***}$
% Humanities, Law, Social and Behavioral Sciences	14.1	22.6	$\chi^2(1)=10.54^{**}$
% Fine Arts, Performing Arts	3.0	3.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Technical Jobs	1.1	1.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Proprietors, Sales	2.0	1.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Mechanics, Industrial Trades	0.7	0.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Construction Trades	0.7	0.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Secretarial-Clerical, Office Workers	1.7	1.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% General Labor, Community and Public Service	1.3	1.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Military Officer	15.8	0.2	$\chi^2(1)=75.51^{***}$
% Housewife	2.0	1.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Other	5.9	6.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
<u>Careers Being Considered: First, Second, or Third Choice^b</u>			
% Engineering, Physical Science, Mathematics, Architecture	24.3	23.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Medical and Biological Sciences	25.8	21.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Business Administration	38.4	47.2	$\chi^2(1)=7.07^{**}$
% General Teaching and Social Service	24.1	33.8	$\chi^2(1)=10.28^{**}$
% Humanities, Law, Social and Behavioral Sciences	32.5	40.9	$\chi^2(1)=6.57^*$
% Fine Arts, Performing Arts	9.1	11.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Technical Jobs	12.6	10.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Proprietors, Sales	7.6	18.3	$\chi^2(1)=22.65^{***}$
% Mechanics, Industrial Trades	5.9	6.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Construction Trades	5.6	7.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Secretarial-Clerical, Office Workers	12.8	14.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% General Labor, Community and Public Service	9.8	13.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Military Officer	51.0	4.3	$\chi^2(1)=253.09^{***}$
% Housewife	11.3	17.7	$\chi^2(1)=7.13^{**}$
% Other	19.3	18.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$

Table 11, continued

Career Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Mean, Importance of Various Job Dimensions ^c</u>			
Salary	4.29	4.21	t(891)=NS
Prestige	3.97	3.95	t(928)=NS
Responsibility	4.33	4.27	t(929)=NS
Interesting People	4.37	4.41	t(929)=NS
Utilization of Skills	4.31	4.24	t(928)=NS
Contribution to Society	4.06	3.95	t(927)=NS
Geographic Desirability	3.89	3.85	t(928)=NS
More Schooling	4.00	3.82	t(928)=2.43*
Stability of Home Life	4.22	4.26	t(928)=NS
Chance to be a Leader	4.20	3.78	t(928)=5.98***
Personal Freedom	4.44	4.38	t(927)=NS
Adventure	4.19	3.89	t(928)=4.52***
Job Security	4.57	4.40	t(929)=3.01**
Chance to Help Others	4.32	4.25	t(929)=NS
Self-Improvement	4.53	4.47	t(929)=NS
Quality of Supervisors	4.26	4.18	t(928)=NS
Interesting/Challenging Job	4.54	4.53	t(929)=NS
Feedback on Performance	4.34	4.27	t(927)=NS
Importance of Work	4.41	4.28	t(929)=2.14*
Family Contentment	4.46	4.41	t(925)=NS
Advancement Opportunity	4.63	4.41	t(925)=3.97***

Table 11, continued

Career Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Mean, Expected Satisfaction in Army for Various Job Dimensions^d</u>			
Salary	3.89	3.46	t(875)=6.02***
Prestige	4.03	3.59	t(922)=6.21***
Responsibility	4.36	3.84	t(922)=8.31***
Interesting People	4.28	3.83	t(922)=6.40***
Utilization of Skills	4.13	3.65	t(922)=6.71***
Contribution to Society	3.93	3.45	t(920)=6.00***
Geographic Desirability	3.81	3.29	t(920)=5.11***
More Schooling	4.14	3.79	t(921)=5.26***
Stability of Home Life	3.70	3.27	t(920)=6.85***
Chance to be a Leader	4.47	4.03	t(920)=5.98***
Personal Freedom	3.76	3.25	t(919)=7.52***
Adventure	4.42	3.92	t(921)=4.89***
Job Security	4.54	4.25	t(920)=8.18***
Chance to Help Others	4.29	3.72	t(920)=8.30***
Self-Improvement	4.44	3.90	t(920)=7.48***
Quality of Supervisors	4.20	3.65	t(917)=8.72***
Interesting/Challenging Job	4.30	3.67	t(920)=7.00***
Feedback on Performance	4.29	3.83	t(918)=9.49***
Importance of Work	4.30	3.64	t(921)=6.28***
Family Contentment	3.99	3.49	t(920)=6.38***
Advancement Opportunity	4.52	4.12	

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 and t were evaluated.

^a 1 = Under \$10,000; 5 = \$25,000 to \$29,999; 6 = \$30,000 to \$34,999; 8 = Over \$40,000

^b Percentages cited in this category refer to percentage of respondents in each group choosing the career as either most likely, second most likely, or third most likely. Since the values reflect the sum of percentages across three items, each column totals approximately 300 percent.

^c 1 = Not Important At All; 5 = Very Important

^d 1 = Very Unsatisfied; 5 = Very Satisfied

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

listed dimensions: More Schooling, Chance to be a Leader, Adventure, Job Security, Importance of Work, and Advancement Opportunity. When the rank order of importance ratings assigned to the dimensions was examined, noteworthy patterns emerged. Both cadets and students included Interesting/Challenging Job and Advancement Opportunity in their list of "top-three" dimensions sought. For cadets the other most important dimension was Job Security; for students it was Self-Improvement.

Not surprisingly, cadets had higher expectations for the satisfactions an Army officer career can bring than students did. Every one of the 21 dimensions studied was given significantly higher expected satisfaction ratings by cadets than by students. Further, it is interesting to note that (a) none of the mean ratings for cadets or students fell below the scale midpoint of 3, indicating that both groups viewed an Army officer career positively from the standpoint of dimensions sought in a job, and (b) cadets and students had a very similar notion of what dimensions an Army officer career satisfies, and what dimensions it does not satisfy. An Army officer career was top-rated by both groups for the dimensions Job Security, Advancement Opportunity, and Chance to be a Leader. It was down-rated for Stability of Home Life, Personal Freedom, and Geographic Desirability.

Knowledge of ROTC and the Army

A set of variables concerning knowledge and awareness of ROTC and the Army is presented in Table 12. The first part of the table lists self-reports concerning the time and sources of awareness of ROTC and the ROTC scholarship program; the latter part displays the results of a true-false information test.

The percentage of cadets reporting that they know "Little or Nothing," "Some," or "A Great Deal" about ROTC was significantly different from the percentage for students. While it is not surprising that over 40% of the students said they knew very little about ROTC and only 7% said they knew a great deal, it is rather surprising that almost 6% of the cadets thought they knew very little and only about 39% knew a great deal. The majority of the cadets were participating in a program about which they claimed only "Some" knowledge. Of course over half of the cadets were in MS I and had been in the ROTC program for only a semester at the time survey data were collected. This may account for the lack of knowledge claimed by cadets.

The difference in the time when the respondents first became aware of ROTC was also somewhat surprising, in that students reported becoming aware of ROTC earlier than cadets. In fact, over 20% of the cadets in the sample said that they first became aware of the program in college. The sources of awareness of ROTC presented in the next section of Table 12 may help to explain this finding. Significantly more cadets than students reported that ROTC personnel, military personnel, and pamphlets helped make them aware of ROTC. These facts would fit if ROTC personnel on college campuses were doing an effective job of recruiting entering freshmen into the ROTC Basic Course.

Examination of the eight significant differences between cadets and students on sources of awareness of ROTC reveals that relatively more

Table 12

Knowledge of ROTC and the Army

ROTC/Army Information Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Self-Reported ROTC Knowledge</u>			$\chi^2(2)=226.15***$
% "Little or Nothing"	5.7	40.9	
% "Some"	55.6	52.1	
% "A Great Deal"	38.8	7.0	
<u>Time of First Awareness of ROTC</u>			$\chi^2(2)=6.43*$
% Grade School	14.6	16.6	
% High School	64.6	69.0	
% College	20.7	14.4	
% Never Heard of ROTC	0.0	0.0	
<u>Sources of Awareness of ROTC</u>			
% Family	42.3	32.7	$\chi^2(1)=8.66**$
% Friends	62.0	64.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	44.3	47.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% ROTC Recruiters	68.3	63.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% ROTC Personnel	71.4	52.9	$\chi^2(1)=32.96***$
% Military Personnel	53.2	40.5	$\chi^2(1)=14.40***$
% Pamphlets	69.1	62.4	$\chi^2(1)=4.38*$
% Radio/TV	46.1	57.4	$\chi^2(1)=11.36***$
% Magazine/Newspaper Ads	48.4	58.4	$\chi^2(1)=9.03**$
% Personal Reading	48.0	29.6	$\chi^2(1)=32.38***$
% Other Sources	42.7	26.7	$\chi^2(1)=25.33***$
<u>Time of First Awareness of ROTC</u>			$\chi^2(3)=37.15***$
<u>Scholarship Program</u>			
% Grade School	2.6	3.2	
% High School	51.0	56.1	
% College	43.4	29.2	
% Never Heard of Program	3.0	11.5	
<u>Sources of Awareness of ROTC</u>			
<u>Scholarship Program</u>			
% Family	27.2	18.7	$\chi^2(1)=8.90**$
% Friends	41.5	38.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	43.9	42.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% ROTC Recruiters	66.4	57.5	$\chi^2(1)=7.46**$
% ROTC Personnel	75.3	45.1	$\chi^2(1)=86.96***$
% Military Personnel	46.3	29.6	$\chi^2(1)=26.94***$
% Pamphlets	58.9	49.3	$\chi^2(1)=8.33**$
% Radio/TV	33.7	40.5	$\chi^2(1)=4.27*$
% Magazine/Newspaper Ads	35.9	41.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Personal Reading	37.8	21.4	$\chi^2(1)=29.20***$
% Other Sources	27.0	19.7	$\chi^2(1)=6.43*$

Table 12, continued

ROTC/Army Information Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Percent of Respondents Answering Correctly on ROTC/Army Information Test</u>			
Graduating from ROTC means that you have to serve four years of active duty in the Army.	65.6	46.6	$\chi^2(1)=32.27***$
ROTC pays all cadets \$100 per month during the freshman and sophomore years of college.	87.3	58.5	$\chi^2(1)=95.14***$
ROTC pays all cadets \$100 per month during the junior and senior years of college.	83.8	71.9	$\chi^2(1)=18.29***$
ROTC is available for both men and women.	98.5	97.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
ROTC scholarships are available for each college year.	83.8	85.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
It is possible to join the last two years of ROTC without attending the first two.	73.3	64.3	$\chi^2(1)=8.28**$
ROTC requires attending a summer camp each year of college.	85.4	54.8	$\chi^2(1)=100.96***$
Some ROTC graduates fulfill most of their Army obligation in the reserves.	83.0	71.9	$\chi^2(1)=15.58***$
The starting base pay for an Army officer is over \$700 per month.	78.3	64.9	$\chi^2(1)=19.68***$
All officers must serve at least 4 years active duty.	58.3	39.6	$\chi^2(1)=31.56***$
Officers can retire after 15 years duty at one-half of their pay.	54.4	45.6	$\chi^2(1)=6.80**$
Postgraduate schooling is available to officers while in the Army.	90.4	87.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
All officers must serve in the infantry for at least one year.	79.5	63.8	$\chi^2(1)=27.10***$
After an obligated duty period, officers may resign from the Army at any time.	75.5	72.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Officers receive a maximum of 20 days paid vacation per year.	51.6	35.9	$\chi^2(1)=22.41***$

Note.

The number in parentheses following the χ^2 statistic is the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 was evaluated.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

cadets had heard of ROTC from personal contacts with people, while relatively more students had become aware of ROTC from the mass media. This would indicate that the radio, TV, magazine, and newspaper ROTC recruitment advertising is effective in reaching students, but may not be particularly effective in getting them to join the program. Those students who do join are more likely to remember personal contacts making them aware of ROTC.

The data in Table 12 concerning the time of first awareness of the ROTC scholarship program and the sources of this awareness parallel the data concerning awareness of the general ROTC program. A slightly higher percentage of students than cadets became aware of the scholarship program before college; over 43% of the cadets first became aware of it in college. Again, a significantly higher percentage of cadets than students became aware of the scholarship program from people--family, ROTC recruiters, ROTC personnel, and military personnel--while relatively more students than cadets noted that radio and TV helped make them aware. For both cadets and students, however, ROTC recruiters and personnel were the most frequently cited information sources.

The latter part of Table 12 presents the results of a knowledge test concerning ROTC and the Army. An inspection of the percentages of students who answered each question correctly reveals that the Army has been very effective in getting the message across concerning some aspects of ROTC. About 97% of the students were aware that ROTC is available for both men and women, 87% were aware that postgraduate schooling is available to officers, 85% were aware that ROTC scholarships are available for each year of college, and over 70% were aware that Advance Course cadets receive a \$100 per month stipend, and that some ROTC graduates fulfill most of their obligation in the reserves. On other aspects of ROTC the students held some mistaken beliefs, however. Occasionally they overestimated the obligations that are entailed in Army service: the majority of the students incorrectly believed that officers receive only 20 days paid vacation per year and that all officers must serve four years of duty. At times the students overestimated the benefits associated with being an ROTC cadet or Army officer: the majority incorrectly believed that officers can retire at half pay after 15 years of service.

A significantly higher percentage of cadets than students answered 11 of the 15 knowledge questions correctly, as would be expected. There were several instances however when a fairly large percentage of the cadets did not answer correctly. Almost half the cadets mistakenly believed that Army officers receive a maximum of 20 paid vacation days per year; over 40% mistakenly believed that officers can retire at half pay after 15 years, and that all officers must serve at least four years of active duty. In fact, over 20% of the cadets believed that all officers must serve in the infantry for at least one year. It would seem that the orientation to the Army that cadets are receiving in the ROTC Basic Course is not completely successful in pointing out the obligations, benefits, and options involved in becoming an Army officer.

Army and ROTC Variables

A final set of variables relating to the Army and ROTC is presented in Table 13. These variables include the experiences and attitudes of the

Table 13
Variables Relating to the Army and ROTC

Army/ROTC Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Percent of Respondents for which Various High School ROTC Programs Were Available</u>			
Army ROTC	26.5	30.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
Navy ROTC	5.4	12.4	$\chi^2(1)=12.95***$
Air Force ROTC	8.7	12.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
<u>Percent of Respondents Participating in High School ROTC</u>			
1 Year	3.3	1.5	$\chi^2(4)=55.57***$
2 Years	2.4	2.8	
3 Years	4.1	0.3	
4 Years	5.7	0.4	
Not Participating Although JROTC Available	18.5	34.2	
<u>Mean, Attractiveness of Various Aspects of High School ROTC^a</u>			
Image of Program	3.15	2.54	$t(239)=4.01***$
Quality of Program	3.36	3.00	$t(287)=2.52*$
Program Requirements	3.14	2.59	$t(288)=4.19***$
Program Activities	3.38	2.66	$t(289)=4.86***$
Program Environment	3.35	2.48	$t(289)=5.69***$
ROTC Instructors	3.46	2.96	$t(287)=3.14**$
ROTC Cadets	3.32	2.60	$t(288)=4.70***$
<u>Influences on Decision to Participate (Cadets) or Not to Participate (Non-Cadets) in ROTC: Most Important</u>			
% Family	17.1	9.3	$\chi^2(1)=11.21***$
% Friends	12.1	14.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	2.2	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% ROTC Recruiters	13.2	5.7	$\chi^2(1)=13.80***$
% ROTC Instructors	10.1	0.9	$\chi^2(1)=34.18***$
% Military Personnel	2.2	1.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Media Advertisements	2.0	0.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Job Market	2.9	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Military Lifestyle	3.9	10.7	$\chi^2(1)=14.04***$
% Personal Beliefs	17.5	25.6	$\chi^2(1)=8.19**$
% Educational Goals	5.7	5.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% Career Goals	10.7	14.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% ROTC Unit Requirements	0.2	1.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$
% ROTC Obligated Service	0.2	6.3	$\chi^2(1)=25.00***$

Table 13, continued

Army/ROTC Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Influences on Decision to Participate (Cadets) or Not to Participate (Non-Cadets) in ROTC: First, Second, or Third Most Important</u>			
% Family	32.4	24.9	$\chi^2 (1)=5.81^*$
% Friends	34.8	33.9	$\chi^2 (1)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	11.2	6.6	$\chi^2 (1)=5.31^*$
% ROTC Recruiters	27.6	13.6	$\chi^2 (1)=25.98^{***}$
% ROTC Instructors	35.4	7.5	$\chi^2 (1)=101.94^{***}$
% Military Personnel	12.7	6.8	$\chi^2 (1)=8.21^{**}$
% Media Advertisements	8.8	4.1	$\chi^2 (1)=7.40^{**}$
% Job Market	10.7	8.8	$\chi^2 (1)=NS$
% Military Lifestyle	16.2	34.8	$\chi^2 (1)=40.30^{***}$
% Personal Beliefs	41.6	49.3	$\chi^2 (1)=5.13^*$
% Educational Goals	23.4	24.9	$\chi^2 (1)=NS$
% Career Goals	36.8	43.4	$\chi^2 (1)=3.90^*$
% ROTC Unit Requirements	3.5	9.7	$\chi^2 (1)=13.21^{***}$
% ROTC Obligated Service	3.1	21.7	$\chi^2 (1)=71.10^{***}$
<u>Mean, Attractiveness of Various Aspects of College ROTC^a</u>			
Image of Program	3.74	2.81	$t(915)=12.92^{***}$
Quality of Program	4.08	3.18	$t(913)=14.05^{***}$
Program Requirements	3.73	2.79	$t(914)=14.53^{***}$
Program Activities	4.13	3.03	$t(914)=16.14^{***}$
Program Environment	3.92	2.84	$t(914)=15.61^{***}$
ROTC Instructors	4.28	3.01	$t(911)=19.28^{***}$
ROTC Cadets	3.62	2.89	$t(914)=10.37^{***}$
Obligated Service	3.39	2.40	$t(913)=13.57^{***}$
Scholarship Program	4.06	3.66	$t(911)=5.47^{***}$
Guaranteed Job	4.14	3.54	$t(914)=7.70^{***}$
<u>Mean, Attractiveness of Various Aspects of the Army^a</u>			
Personal Freedom	2.96	2.17	$t(919)=11.08^{***}$
Training	3.67	2.50	$t(920)=15.74^{***}$
Discipline	3.54	2.54	$t(920)=13.31^{***}$
Living Arrangements	3.22	2.21	$t(927)=15.16^{***}$
Goals of Army	3.85	2.91	$t(926)=12.80^{***}$
Relevance of Military to Society	3.77	2.84	$t(927)=13.67^{***}$
Army Officer Quality	3.84	3.15	$t(925)=9.93^{***}$
Prejudice	2.91	2.47	$t(923)=6.24^{***}$
Personal Relationships	3.43	2.80	$t(926)=9.88^{***}$
Travel	3.62	3.04	$t(927)=7.28^{***}$
Army's Public Image	3.42	2.72	$t(926)=9.62^{***}$
Recreation	3.89	3.13	$t(926)=11.33^{***}$
Pay and Benefits	4.11	3.44	$t(926)=9.99^{***}$
Officer Responsibilities	4.00	3.20	$t(924)=12.04^{***}$
Day-to-Day Activities	3.74	2.79	$t(925)=14.24^{***}$
Job Security	4.25	3.62	$t(927)=9.17^{***}$

Table 13, continued

Army/ROTC Variables	Respondents		Test of Significance, ROTC Membership
	ROTC Cadets	Non-ROTC Students	
<u>Feelings About Military Service</u>			$\chi^2(3)=183.19***$
% Who Will Not Serve if Called	3.8	17.8	
% Who Haven't Thought Much About Service	16.8	38.6	
% Who Feel Duty to Serve if Needed	51.8	41.0	
% Who Feel Duty to Serve	27.7	2.6	

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 and t were evaluated.

^a 1 = Very Unattractive; 5 = Very Attractive

^b Percentages cited in this category refer to percentages of respondents in each group choosing the influence as either most important, second most important, or third most important. Since the values reflect the sum of percentages across three items, total percent in each column equals 300%.

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

respondents concerning high school Junior ROTC (JROTC), the influences on their decision whether or not to participate in college ROTC, and their feelings concerning college ROTC, the Army and military service.

From the first two sections of the table it can be seen that even though relatively more students than cadets had the opportunity to participate in JROTC (although only the difference for the availability of Navy JROTC was significant), relatively fewer college students than college cadets chose to do so. Close to half of the college cadets who had a high school ROTC program available to them participated in it, while less than 15% of the college students who had JROTC available in their high school participated. This would seem to indicate the presence of an early predisposition to a career as a military officer that results in exploration in high school if the opportunity is available.

The last section of Table 13 supports the indication that cadets and students had different military participation tendencies. Almost 80% of the college cadets reported feeling that they had a duty to serve in the military if needed, or that they had a duty regardless of need. The comparable value for college students was a little over 40%. In fact, about 56% of the college students in the survey reported that they would not serve in the military even if called, or that they had not given much thought to military service.

Respondents were asked to rate certain aspects of high school ROTC if a program had been available to them. Some caution must be employed in interpreting the answers to this question as a little over 3% of respondents said their high school did not have JROTC but then rated it. College cadets consistently and significantly rated JROTC higher than did students, with students giving every aspect but one a negative (below the scale midpoint) rating. High school students who went on to become college cadets were most impressed with the JROTC instructors and least impressed with the program image and requirements. College students not in ROTC were most impressed with JROTC program quality and least impressed with the program environment.

Ratings given by both the cadet and student groups to their college ROTC program were consistently higher than analogous ratings given to the JROTC programs in the high schools they attended. Not surprisingly, cadets also rated various aspects of college ROTC uniformly and significantly higher than did students, with cadets again giving their ROTC instructors the highest attractiveness rating. Both students and cadets rated the fact that participation in college ROTC can guarantee a job quite highly. However, they gave the fact that this job is an obligation the lowest attractiveness rating.

When respondents were asked to rate the attractiveness of various aspects of the Army, cadets and students reported similar perceptions in terms of relatively favorable versus relatively unfavorable features. Both groups agreed that the most attractive aspects of the Army were the pay and benefits and the job security, both very practical considerations. The two groups also agreed that the least attractive aspects of the Army were prejudice, living arrangements, and (lack of) personal freedom. Not surprisingly, however, the cadet ratings were significantly more favorable in

every case. In fact, most of the student mean ratings were on the negative side of the five-point scale. It should be noted that while the student ratings of the Army officer career, viewed as an occupation, were predominantly positive (all 21 ratings above the scale midpoint of 3; see Table 11), their ratings of the Army as a more general institution and lifestyle were predominantly negative, with only six of the 16 mean ratings falling above the midpoint of 3 (see Table 13).

When the respondents were questioned about the most important influences on their decision whether or not to participate in college ROTC, the pattern seen earlier--with relatively more cadets reporting being influenced by people and relatively more students reporting being influenced by other sources--again emerged. A significantly higher percentage of cadets than students listed family, ROTC recruiters, and ROTC instructors as the most important influence on their joining ROTC. A significantly higher percentage of students noted that the military lifestyle, personal beliefs, or the obligated service entailed by ROTC membership was the most important influence on their decision not to participate in college ROTC. These differences remained when second and third most important influences were added to the first, and several new ones emerged. Relatively more cadets than students reported that teachers and counselors, military personnel, and media advertisements were among the top three influences on whether or not to join ROTC. Relatively more students reported that their career goals and the ROTC unit requirements were among the major influences keeping them from joining.

These data seem to indicate that individuals who become ROTC cadets do not hold personal beliefs or attitudes about ROTC or the Army that prevent them from joining, and thus they are influenced by the opinions and beliefs of others. Students who do not join ROTC hold personal beliefs and opinions about the military that are strong enough so that they are not greatly influenced by others.

Section 2. Subgroup Differences

This section presents the ROTC cadet and non-ROTC student responses to the survey broken down by sex and ethnic background. Sex and ethnic background differences were analyzed independently; the assumption of independence implicit behind these analyses seems generally valid, with a minor caution. As can be seen in Table 5, there were about the same numbers of males and females in the black and Hispanic ROTC and non-ROTC subgroups, but not in the white ROTC and non-ROTC subgroups. There were over twice as many white male as white female cadets, and over a fourth as many white male as white female students. Thus, differences in whites vs blacks and Hispanics could be due to the responses of white males alone, with any white female "contribution" being obscured by the sheer numbers of white males. Some caution is thus due when viewing significant differences attributable to the white subgroup, especially when these findings parallel findings from the male subgroup.

The discussion in this section will follow the major topic areas of Section 1, but will not proceed through the accompanying data tables step by step. The results will be discussed when the subgroup breakdowns amplify the cadet vs student differences presented in Section 1, when clear patterns of sex or ethnic group differences emerge over sets of variables, when highly significant differences ($p < .01$) on individual items are present, or when an item or item set could have a particularly important impact on ROTC recruitment.

Demographic Profile

The breakdown of the respondents by sex and ethnic background on the demographic variables is presented in Table 14. The type of community in which the respondents grew up was somewhat limited by the particular colleges in the sample; it was seen earlier that there were no significant differences between ROTC cadets and non-ROTC students on this characteristic. Sex did have a slight effect, however (with proportionately more male than female students tending to come from large communities), and ethnic background had a highly significant effect. Higher percentages of blacks than Hispanics or whites came from a rural area, higher percentages of Hispanics came from a large city, and higher percentages of whites came from a suburb.

It was noted earlier that students reported a somewhat higher average family income than did cadets. The differences by ethnic group for both cadets and students were very large. White respondents had a substantially larger average family income than did either blacks or Hispanics. The range for cadets was from about \$26,900 per year for whites to \$12,200 for blacks. The range for students was not quite as large, from about \$27,300 for whites to \$15,500 for Hispanics. The black cadets appeared to be a special case in terms of average family income. Because of their income levels, blacks, and perhaps Hispanics, may have found ROTC more attractive for monetary reasons than whites did. They may have believed that ROTC presented them with an opportunity to establish themselves in a career with a strong guarantee of an income higher than their parents were able to earn. This speculation will be addressed again when ratings of the important aspects of a job and the potential for satisfying these aspects in the Army are discussed.

Table 14

Demographic Profile of Survey Respondents

Demographic Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Mean, Age of Respondents	18.98	19.26	$t(458)=2.75^*$	19.12	19.32	19.13	F(2,457)=NS	19.39	19.88	$t(466)=2.78^{**}$	19.31	20.19	19.52	F(2,465)=6.06**
Region of Socialization ^{a,b}														
% East	6.3	12.1	NA ^a	2.8	1.4	16.3	NA ^a	11.1	14.2	NA ^a	3.6	0.0	19.1	NA ^a
% Midwest	10.3	11.4		6.4	1.4	16.3		18.1	17.4		14.3	1.8	24.1	
% West	8.6	12.1		2.1	15.9	14.2		17.1	17.0		7.1	6.4	22.8	
% South	66.3	56.6		82.3	59.6	45.1		50.5	46.6		67.9	89.1	30.0	
% Outside U.S.	2.9	2.5		2.8	5.8	1.6		0.9	2.8		7.1	1.8	1.0	
% Several Regions	5.7	5.3		3.5	5.8	6.5		2.3	2.0		0.0	0.9	3.0	
Type of Community Grew Up			$\chi^2(4)=NS$				$\chi^2(8)=36.78^{***}$			$\chi^2(4)=11.59^*$				$\chi^2(8)=33.42^{***}$
% Rural	15.3	9.5		13.4	11.3	10.9		14.4	12.6		18.2	7.3	14.9	
% Small City/Town	33.9	36.0		41.5	25.4	34.4		38.6	29.6		15.5	36.4	34.3	
% Medium City	20.3	19.8		21.8	26.8	17.0		22.8	19.0		27.3	24.5	18.2	
% Suburb	10.7	15.9		5.6	4.2	21.5		11.2	17.0		9.1	3.6	19.1	
% Large City	19.8	18.7		17.6	32.4	16.2		13.0	21.7		20.0	28.2	13.5	
Mean, Parents' Annual Income ^c	4.20	4.81	$t(448)=2.56^*$	2.94	3.44	5.88	F(2,447)=93.73***	5.05	5.17	$t(456)=NS$	3.66	3.60	5.96	F(2,455)=61.18***

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

^a A significance test was not performed for differences in Region of Socialization because the sample was stratified on this variable.

^b Region of Socialization was derived from the following questionnaire item, "Where did you spend the majority of your elementary and high school years?"

East: 1. New England (Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont)

2. Middle Atlantic (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania)

Midwest: 3. East North Central (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin)

4. West North Central (Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas)

West: 5. Mountain (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada)

6. Pacific (Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii)

South: 7. South Atlantic (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida)

8. East South Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi)

9. West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas)

Outside U.S.: 10. Didn't grow up in the United States

Several Regions: 11. Moved around too much to consider myself from any one region

^c 1 = Under \$5,000; 4 = \$15,000 to \$19,999; 5 = \$20,000 to \$24,999; 9 = Over

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Military-Related Background

The subgroup differences on the military-related background variables presented in Table 15 paralleled those found for demographic profile: ethnic background often had a highly significant effect, while sex did not.

There was a tendency for relatively more whites than blacks or Hispanics to report individuals from earlier generations having military experience--parents, grandparents, and aunts and uncles. There was a tendency for relatively more blacks and Hispanics than whites to report individuals from the present generation having military experience--brothers and sisters, cousins, and friends. These findings may reflect the increasing opportunities for minority groups in the military in recent years.

A significantly higher proportion of male than female cadets reported parents' (presumably father's) prior or present participation in the military--with almost 70% of the male cadets doing so. This could indicate a rather strong modeling effect for males. The difference among the percentages of each ethnic group who reported parents in the military was also significant, with over two-thirds of the white cadets and only about half of the black and Hispanic cadets reporting parental military experience. The ethnic group difference may reflect the fact that there were relatively fewer minority group members participating in the military during the time when the respondents' parents were eligible.

All cadet subgroups showed the socialization effect of increased contact with the military: a higher proportion of them reported relatives or friends in the military than did students in every case.

Black and Hispanic cadets not only reported more friends in the military than did white cadets, but they also attributed a significantly higher opinion of the status of an Army career to these friends than did white cadets. Similarly, black and Hispanic non-ROTC students thought that their friends would rate the Army higher than white students thought their friends would. This may reflect the fact that the Army has made real progress in integrating its ranks, and is seen as a viable career environment by minority groups. It may also reflect the fact that the Army's current need for voluntary manpower opens up opportunities for people left out of civilian alternatives.

Media Preferences

Differences in the media preferences of the respondents according to their sex and ethnic background were examined; data are presented in Table 16. As discussed earlier, cadets as a group and students as a group attended to similar media categories. When the respondents were divided into males vs females, however, a variety of significant differences were apparent in media category preferences. There were very few significant differences among the three ethnic groups.

The significant differences in the media category preferences of males vs females were as would be expected from the topic areas of each category. Relatively more males preferred sports/outdoor magazines, mechanics/science magazines, automotive magazines, and men's magazines. Relatively more females preferred women's magazines and home service magazines. Note that

Table 15

Military Experience and Attitudes of Family and Friends

Military Socialization Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Relatives <u>ever</u> in ROTC	13.6	19.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	8.5	14.1	22.7	$\chi^2(2)=13.27^{**}$	13.0	15.7	(1)=NS	21.4	10.9	15.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% with Parents in ROTC	22.3	18.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	23.9	28.2	14.1	$\chi^2(2)=8.73^*$	14.0	15.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	21.4	25.5	9.9	$\chi^2(2)=17.36^{***}$
% with Siblings in ROTC	28.2	27.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	39.0	26.8	21.2	$\chi^2(2)=14.20^{***}$	27.9	19.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	39.3	31.8	17.6	$\chi^2(2)=17.78^{***}$
% with Cousins in ROTC	24.3	26.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	27.1	21.1	26.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	18.1	18.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	30.4	19.1	15.6	$\chi^2(2)=6.97^*$
% with Aunts or Uncles in ROTC	8.1	9.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	6.4	9.9	10.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	7.0	4.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.1	1.8	6.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% with Grandparents in ROTC	65.3	57.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	62.0	67.6	57.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	50.2	50.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	51.8	64.5	44.9	$\chi^2(2)=12.55^{**}$
Relatives <u>living</u> in the Military	44.6	68.1	$\chi^2(1)=23.73^{***}$	45.0	52.1	69.1	$\chi^2(2)=23.13^{***}$	52.8	56.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	35.7	32.7	66.4	$\chi^2(2)=46.54^{***}$
% with Parents in Military	30.5	20.1	$\chi^2(1)=5.83^*$	34.5	28.2	16.7	$\chi^2(2)=16.35^{***}$	19.1	16.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	25.0	25.5	17.6	$\chi^2(2)=10.10^{**}$
% with Siblings in Military	56.6	53.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	67.6	64.8	43.7	$\chi^2(2)=24.43^{***}$	49.3	47.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	58.9	58.2	42.4	$\chi^2(2)=11.06^{**}$
% with Cousins in Military	66.7	68.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	63.1	70.4	69.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	66.0	62.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	50.0	61.8	67.3	$\chi^2(2)=6.44^*$
% with Aunts or Uncles in Military	28.7	40.3	$\chi^2(1)=5.75^*$	22.7	21.1	47.8	$\chi^2(2)=32.39^{***}$	29.3	31.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	8.9	14.5	40.3	$\chi^2(2)=39.14^{***}$
% with Grandparents in Military	80.5	74.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	85.1	81.7	70.6	$\chi^2(2)=11.68^{**}$	65.7	63.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	66.1	73.6	61.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
Mean Friends' Rating of an Army Officer Career ^a	3.38	3.22	$t(459)=NS$	3.50	3.45	3.11	$F(2,458)=7.97^{***}$	2.91	2.81	$t(467)=NS$	3.20	3.10	2.72	$F(2,466)=9.11^{***}$
Mean Parents' Rating of an Army Officer Career ^a	3.83	3.95	$t(459)=NS$	3.87	4.04	3.88	$F(2,458)=NS$	3.38	3.30	$t(467)=NS$	3.20	3.46	3.32	$F(2,466)=NS$

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

a 1 = Very Low Status; 5 = Very High Status

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Table 16
Media Preferences

Media Variables	Respondents										Non-ROTC Students				
	ROTC Cadets					Non-ROTC Students					Non-ROTC Students				
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male
Percent Who Attend to Various Media Categories Occasionally or Regularly															
Business/Trade Magazines	29.9	40.8	$\chi^2(1)=4.69^*$	39.3	24.6	38.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	24.5	32.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	33.2	23.5	29.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Sports/Outdoor Magazines	54.2	70.8	$\chi^2(1)=8.43^{**}$	67.0	64.2	60.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	50.8	73.0	$\chi^2(1)=17.15^{***}$	59.1	56.6	63.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Mechanics/Science Magazines	19.4	42.7	$\chi^2(1)=23.46^{***}$	27.2	42.2	34.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	12.9	30.8	$\chi^2(1)=19.40^{***}$	23.1	26.4	20.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Automotive Magazines	6.4	28.1	$\chi^2(1)=29.76^{***}$	20.3	20.9	18.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	6.9	27.2	$\chi^2(1)=30.33^{***}$	22.2	21.4	15.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Men's Magazines	20.9	44.8	$\chi^2(1)=24.23^{***}$	33.9	33.3	35.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	15.4	48.1	$\chi^2(1)=50.61^{***}$	40.4	31.3	30.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Women's Magazines	68.8	10.5	$\chi^2(1)=122.88^{***}$	40.4	30.5	25.9	$\chi^2(2)=23.05^{***}$	80.4	8.3	$\chi^2(1)=182.09^{***}$	41.5	37.3	25.1	$\chi^2(2)=7.40^*$	
Home Service Magazines	57.1	13.4	$\chi^2(1)=90.30^{***}$	37.2	20.3	26.2	$\chi^2(2)=7.47^*$	63.3	9.6	$\chi^2(1)=133.47^{***}$	40.4	27.4	30.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
General Magazines	68.3	68.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	70.1	55.8	71.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	77.3	56.2	$\chi^2(1)=8.21^{**}$	53.8	69.9	61.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Newspapers	79.1	76.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	69.0	71.0	83.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	77.8	81.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	76.9	78.9	80.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Sunday Supplements	56.2	51.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	48.0	48.7	58.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	56.5	47.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	46.3	56.6	51.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Television	69.2	73.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	71.1	73.9	71.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	67.4	59.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	57.1	65.8	63.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Radio	69.2	78.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	73.1	66.7	79.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	64.1	71.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	46.7	77.8	69.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Billboards	57.3	50.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	55.7	41.5	55.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	55.1	46.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	55.6	46.7	50.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Percent Who Read Various Magazines Occasionally or Regularly															
Exploring	9.4	6.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.8	9.2	7.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	3.8	5.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	12.7	5.6	2.7	$\chi^2(2)=11.04^{**}$	
Senior Scholastic	14.7	8.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	22.4	8.7	5.3	$\chi^2(2)=27.34^{***}$	10.5	4.0	$\chi^2(1)=6.49^*$	16.7	11.9	3.4	$\chi^2(2)=18.03^{***}$	
Campus Life	21.9	12.4	$\chi^2(1)=6.39^*$	25.7	22.4	8.7	$\chi^2(2)=21.15^{***}$	17.2	8.8	$\chi^2(1)=6.32^*$	18.5	15.0	10.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Newsweek	45.4	57.1	$\chi^2(1)=6.24^*$	47.2	50.0	56.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	46.0	48.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	46.3	58.9	43.3	$\chi^2(2)=6.38^*$	
Time	54.0	61.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	53.4	57.7	62.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	49.5	49.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	55.8	56.5	44.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
US News & World Report	27.7	38.3	$\chi^2(1)=4.35^*$	32.0	37.3	34.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	19.9	26.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	25.0	26.0	22.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Liberty	14.1	14.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	71.4	8.6	0.8	$\chi^2(2)=208.14^{***}$	7.7	4.1	$\chi^2(1)=15.90^{***}$	63.0	3.7	1.3	$\chi^2(2)=75.64^{***}$	
Sports Illustrated	77.2	55.1	$\chi^2(1)=10.45^{**}$	51.7	50.0	45.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	30.7	51.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	42.5	39.3	40.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
TV Guide	49.2	39.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	50.5	37.0	41.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	45.8	40.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	54.3	48.3	39.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Crisis	5.5	3.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	10.1	5.8	0.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	2.3	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	9.1	3.6	0.3	$\chi^2(2)=18.57^{***}$	
Nutshell	3.5	4.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.3	2.9	4.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	3.3	4.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.3	0.9	4.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Field & Stream	10.3	24.1	$\chi^2(1)=12.21^{***}$	8.5	16.9	25.3	$\chi^2(2)=16.43^{***}$	5.6	17.2	$\chi^2(1)=13.67^{***}$	9.3	8.3	13.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Popular Mechanics	9.7	23.2	$\chi^2(1)=12.04^{***}$	11.7	21.2	20.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	2.8	16.0	$\chi^2(1)=20.89^{***}$	13.5	7.5	10.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Current World	17.9	8.0	$\chi^2(1)=8.85^{**}$	26.4	11.9	4.0	$\chi^2(2)=40.71^{***}$	6.3	5.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	11.5	6.5	4.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
College Outlook	17.8	9.6	$\chi^2(1)=5.59^*$	27.8	15.7	4.1	$\chi^2(2)=42.83^{***}$	8.9	4.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	11.5	9.2	5.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
People	38.9	32.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	30.8	28.1	38.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	45.3	33.8	$\chi^2(1)=5.21^*$	43.8	40.2	37.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Jet	10.1	9.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	60.4	2.9	0.4	$\chi^2(2)=187.09^{***}$	6.0	3.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	50.0	1.8	0.7	$\chi^2(2)=165.39^{***}$	

Table 16, continued

Media Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets					Non-ROTC Students								
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Percent Who Read Various Magazines Occasionally or Regularly (Cont.)	12.8	5.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	37.6	2.9	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=120.47***$	3.8	3.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	35.0	0.0	0.7	$\chi^2(2)=127.00***$
	4.5	2.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	9.4	2.9	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=24.61***$	1.4	1.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.3	0.0	0.7	$\chi^2(2)=17.81***$
	10.9	22.3	$\chi^2(1)=8.00**$	25.0	18.6	14.2	$\chi^2(2)=6.05*$	9.0	21.2	$\chi^2(1)=11.84***$	24.0	15.0	14.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	2.3	7.2	$\chi^2(1)=4.21*$	7.2	8.8	3.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.4	6.4	$\chi^2(1)=6.21*$	9.3	2.8	3.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	1.1	4.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.0	4.4	1.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	3.3	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.6	2.8	2.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	4.0	16.5	$\chi^2(1)=15.25***$	5.6	19.7	12.9	$\chi^2(2)=9.55**$	2.3	10.0	$\chi^2(1)=10.12**$	11.1	4.5	6.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	5.1	16.1	$\chi^2(1)=11.20***$	6.4	23.5	11.5	$\chi^2(2)=12.92**$	1.9	19.9	$\chi^2(1)=35.21***$	10.9	10.9	11.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	3.4	3.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.3	2.9	1.6	$\chi^2(2)=8.47*$	2.3	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.4	1.8	1.3	$\chi^2(2)=8.18*$
	6.4	5.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	19.4	1.4	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=60.91***$	4.2	1.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	24.5	0.0	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=104.21***$
	0.6	0.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.7	0.0	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	0.9	0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.6	0.0	0.3	$\chi^2(2)=8.69*$
	1.2	1.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.1	0.0	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=16.23***$	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA
	10.1	6.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	27.9	0.0	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=95.76***$	4.2	2.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	25.5	0.0	0.7	$\chi^2(2)=90.85***$
	1.7	2.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	7.4	0.4	$\chi^2(2)=13.31**$	2.3	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.6	6.7	0.3	$\chi^2(2)=15.67***$
	1.7	0.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	2.9	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=6.20*$	0.5	1.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	2.7	0.3	$\chi^2(2)=6.01*$
	22.6	6.1	$\chi^2(1)=23.74***$	11.2	4.7	14.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	37.4	4.8	$\chi^2(1)=71.55***$	15.1	21.3	17.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	5.1	17.5	$\chi^2(1)=13.53***$	10.9	16.7	12.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	2.3	17.7	$\chi^2(1)=27.11***$	12.7	10.0	10.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	11.4	28.5	$\chi^2(1)=17.24***$	14.6	26.1	24.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	7.0	18.5	$\chi^2(1)=12.49***$	13.0	13.6	13.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	6.9	14.9	$\chi^2(1)=5.71*$	8.8	18.5	11.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	7.5	11.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.3	11.0	9.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	29.9	35.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	20.0	35.0	41.5	$\chi^2(2)=16.84***$	33.0	29.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	16.4	33.0	33.5	$\chi^2(2)=6.43*$
	6.3	14.7	$\chi^2(1)=6.62*$	17.9	11.9	7.3	$\chi^2(2)=9.70**$	2.8	11.4	$\chi^2(1)=10.74**$	5.9	4.7	8.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
55.5	48.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	52.7	51.7	49.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	45.4	34.4	$\chi^2(1)=4.46*$	42.0	47.3	35.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
2.3	2.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	9.5	0.8	$\chi^2(2)=15.99***$	4.2	1.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.6	9.4	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=27.30***$	

Note.

The number in parentheses following the χ^2 statistic is the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 was evaluated.* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

there were no significant differences due to sex or ethnic background for the categories of newspapers, television, and radio, and that these were attended to by about the highest percentages of each subgroup.

Another way to look at the information concerning media category preferences is to rank order the categories by subgroup as is done in Tables 17 and 18. Here the category picked by the highest percentage of a subgroup is presented first, with the next highest following, and so on down the list. The information in Tables 17 and 18 provides a quick identification of subgroup preferences. Newspapers are the category regularly read by the highest percentage of each non-ROTC student subgroup with the single exception of females. Proportionately more female students reported that they regularly read women's magazines than reported regular reading of newspapers.

The breakdown by sex and ethnic background of the respondents who read various magazines occasionally or regularly is also presented in Table 16. Magazines targeted to a particular audience are quite successful. For example, a significantly higher percentage of females than males read Cosmopolitan, while proportionately more blacks than Hispanics or whites read Ebony. A rank ordering of the most preferred magazines by subgroup is presented in Tables 19 and 20. This ranking makes it easier to identify the most likely targets for reaching a particular subgroup.

Comparing the rankings across Tables 17-18 and 19-20 gives a clear picture of the magazine reading preferences of the various subgroups. General magazines and sports/outdoor magazines were high on the list for every subgroup. Females--and especially female students--most preferred women's magazines, and preferred home service magazines over sports/outdoor magazines. When Table 20 is examined it can be seen that the only women's magazine on the list--Cosmopolitan--was read occasionally or regularly by over a third of the female students. Since over 80% of female students stated that they occasionally or regularly read women's magazines, the list presented in the survey must not have included the favorites. Table 9 in Section 1 presented the compilation of "write-in" magazines (magazines not on the survey list which over 2% of respondents reported reading occasionally or regularly) and gave examples of other widely read women's magazines.

Respondents were also asked, via two open-ended questions, to list their "favorite television programs" and their "favorite types of radio programming--e.g., AM or FM, rock, classical, sports, etc." Answers to these open-ended questions were tallied by subgroup, and results are presented in detail in Tables 21 (data on cadets' favorite television shows), 22 (data on students' favorite television programs), 23 (data on cadets' favorite radio programs), and 24 (data on students' favorite radio programs). Favorite television shows included Mork and Mindy, MASH, and 60 Minutes for most subgroups, with blacks also preferring The Jeffersons, Diff'rent Strokes, and What's Happening. The two categories of radio programming most frequently cited by the Hispanic and white cadets and students were FM and rock. Blacks, however, tended to prefer soul or jazz ahead of rock.

Table 17
Rank Ordering of Media Categories
Attended to Occasionally or Regularly: ROTC Cadets^a

Female (n=177)		Males (n=284)		Black (n=143)		Hispanic (n=71)		White (n=247)	
Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group
Newspapers	79.1	Radio	78.8	Radio	73.1	Television	73.9	Newspapers	83.5
Television	69.2	Newspapers	76.3	Television	71.1	Newspapers	71.0	Radio	79.6
Radio	69.2	Television	73.2	General	70.1	Radio	66.7	Television	71.6
Women's	68.8	Sports/Outdoor	70.8	Magazines		Sports/Outdoor	64.2	General	71.1
Magazines		Magazines		Newspapers	69.0	Magazines		Magazines	
General	68.3	General	68.4	Sports/Outdoor	67.0	General	55.8	Sports/Outdoor	60.7
Magazines		Magazines		Magazines		Magazines		Magazines	
Home Service	57.9	Sunday Supplements	51.7	Billboards	55.7	Sunday Supplements	48.7	Sunday Supplements	58.7
Magazines		Billboards	50.7	Sunday Supplements	48.0	Billboards	42.2	Billboards	55.4
Billboards	57.3	Men's Magazines	44.8	Business/Trade	39.3	Mechanics/Science Magazines	41.5	Business/Trade	38.3
Sunday Supplements	56.2	Mechanics/Science Magazines	42.7	Magazines		Billboards	33.3	Magazines	
ments		Business/Trade	40.8	Home Service	37.2	Men's Magazines	30.5	Men's Magazines	35.3
Sports/Outdoor	54.2	Business/Trade		Magazines		Women's		Mechanics/Science	34.1
Magazines		Magazines		Men's Magazines	33.9	Magazines		Magazines	
Business/Trade	29.9	Automotive	28.1	Mechanics/Science	27.2	Business/Trade	24.6		
Magazines		Magazines		Home Service	20.3	Magazines			
Men's Magazines	20.8	Magazines		Automotive		Automotive	20.9		
				Magazines		Home Service	20.3		
						Magazines			

^a Media categories attended to occasionally or regularly by fewer than 20% of a subgroup are not reported.

Table 18

Rank Ordering of Media Categories
 Attended to Occasionally or Regularly: Non-ROTC Students^a

Group					
Female (n=216)		Males (n=254)		Black (n=56)	
Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group
Women's Magazines	80.4	Newspapers	81.0	Newspapers	78.9
Newspapers	77.8	Sports/Outdoor	73.0	Sports/Outdoor	77.8
General Magazines	72.3	Magazines	71.0	General Magazines	69.9
Television	67.4	Radio	59.0	Television	65.8
Radio	64.1	General	56.2	Sunday Supplements	56.6
Home Service	63.3	Men's Magazines	48.1	Sports/Outdoor	56.6
Sunday Supplements	56.5	Sunday Supplements	47.7	Billboards	46.7
Billboards	55.1	Billboards	46.3	Women's Magazines	37.3
Sports/Outdoor	50.8	Business/Trade Magazines	32.6	Men's Magazines	31.3
Business/Trade Magazines	24.5	Mechanics/Science Automotive Magazines	27.2	Home Service	27.4
				Magazines	26.4
				Mechanics/Science Automotive Magazines	23.6
				Business/Trade	21.4
				Magazines	
				Women's Magazines	25.1
				Mechanics/Science Automotive Magazines	20.8
				Billboards	50.0
				Home Service	30.8
				Magazines	
				Men's Magazines	30.1
				Business/Trade	29.9
				Magazines	
				Women's Magazines	25.1
				Mechanics/Science Automotive Magazines	20.8

^a Media categories attended to occasionally or regularly by fewer than 20% of a subgroup are not reported.

Table 19

Rank Ordering of Magazines Read Occasionally
or Regularly: ROTC Cadets^a

Female (n=177)			Males (n=284)			Black (n=143)			Hispanic (n=71)			White (n=247)		
Category	% of Group		Category	% of Group		Category	% of Group		Category	% of Group		Category	% of Group	
Reader's Digest ^b	55.5		Time	61.6		Ebony	71.4		Time	57.7		Time	62.2	
TV Guide	54.0		Newsweek	57.1		Jet	60.4		Reader's Digest ^b	51.7		Newsweek	56.8	
Newsweek	49.2		Sports	55.3		Time	53.4		Newsweek	50.0		Reader's Digest ^b	49.5	
People	45.4		Illustrated			Reader's Digest ^b	52.7		Sports	50.0		Sports	45.1	
Sports	38.9		Reader's Digest ^b	48.3		Sports	51.7		Illustrated			Illustrated		
Illustrated	37.2		TV Guide	39.8		Illustrated			U.S. News and	37.3		National	41.5	
National	29.9		U.S. News and	38.3		TV Guide	50.5		World Report			Geographic		
Geographic			World Report			Newsweek	47.2		TV Guide	37.0		TV Guide	41.2	
U.S. News and	27.7		National	35.2		Black Sports	37.6		National	35.0		People	38.8	
World Report			Geographic			U.S. News and	32.0		Geographic			U.S. News and	34.3	
Cosmopolitan	22.6		People	32.6		World Report			People	28.1		World Report		
Campus Life	21.9		Popular Science	28.5		People	30.8		Popular Science	26.1		Field and	25.3	
Senior	14.7		Field and	24.1		Black	27.9		Road and Track	23.5		Stream		
Scholastic			Stream			Enterprise			Campus Life	22.4		Popular Science	24.5	
Ebony	14.1		Popular	23.2		College Outlook	27.8		Popular	21.2		Popular	20.3	
Black Sports	12.8		Mechanics			Career World	26.4		Mechanics			Mechanics		
Popular Science	11.4		Sport	22.3		Campus Life	25.7		Mechanix	19.7		Sport	14.2	
Sport	10.9		Car and Driver	17.5		Sport	25.0		Illustrated			Cosmopolitan	14.0	
Field and	10.3		Mechanix	16.5		Senior	22.4		Sport	18.6		Mechanix	12.9	
Stream			Illustrated			Scholastic			Popular	18.5		Illustrated		
Jet	10.1		Road and Track	16.1		National	20.0		Photography			Car and Driver	12.5	
Black	10.1		Popular	14.9		Geographic			Field and	16.9		Popular	11.7	
Enterprise			Photography			Black Collegian	19.4		Stream			Photography		
			Stereo Review	14.7		Stereo Review	17.9		Car and Driver	16.7		Road and Track	11.5	
			Ebony	14.1		Popular Science	14.6		College Outlook	15.7				
			Campus Life	12.4		Popular	11.7		Career World	11.9				
						Mechanics			Stereo Review	11.9				
						Cosmopolitan	11.2							
						Car and Driver	10.9							
						Crisis	10.1							

^a Magazines read occasionally or regularly by fewer than 10% of a subgroup are not reported.

^b Regular (not Spanish) version.

Table 20

Rank Ordering of Magazines Read Occasionally
or Regularly: Non-ROTC Students^a

Group									
Female (n=216)		Males (n=254)		Black (n=56)		Hispanic (n=110)		White (n=304)	
Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group
Time	49.5	Sports	51.4	Ebony	63.0	Newsweek	58.9	Time	44.9
Newsweek	46.0	Illustrated		Time	55.8	Time	56.5	Newsweek	43.3
TV Guide	45.8	Time	49.0	TV Guide	54.3	TV Guide	48.3	Sports	40.3
Reader's Digest ^b	45.4	Newsweek	48.7	Jet	50.0	Reader's Digest ^b	47.3	Illustrated	
People	45.3	TV Guide	40.6	Newsweek	46.3	People	40.2	TV Guide	39.1
National	33.0	Reader's Digest ^b	34.4	People	43.8	Sports	39.3	People	37.3
Geographic		People	33.8	Sports	42.5	Illustrated		Reader's Digest ^b	35.7
Cosmopolitan	37.4	National	29.5	Illustrated		National	33.0	National	33.5
Sports	30.7	Geographic		Reader's Digest ^b	42.0	Geographic		Geographic	
Illustrated		U.S. News and	26.9	Black Sports	35.0	U.S. News and	26.0	U.S. News and	22.6
U.S. News and	19.9	World Report		Black	25.5	World Report		World Report	
World Report		Sport	21.2	Enterprise		Cosmopolitan	21.3	Cosmopolitan	17.4
Campus Life	17.2	Road and Track	19.9	U.S. News and	25.0	Sport	15.0	Sport	14.0
Senior	10.5	Popular Science	18.5	World Report		Campus Life	15.0	Field and	13.6
Scholastic		Car and Driver	17.7	Black Collegian	24.5	Popular Science	13.6	Stream	
		Field and	17.2	Sport	24.0	Senior	11.9	Popular Science	13.0
		Stream		Campus Life	18.5	Scholastic		Road and Track	11.8
		Popular	16.0	Senior	16.7	Popular	11.0	Campus Life	10.6
		Mechanics		Scholastic		Photography		Car and Driver	10.2
		Stereo Review	11.4	National	16.4	Road and Track	10.9	Popular	10.0
		Popular	11.3	Geographic		Car and Driver	10.0	Mechanics	
		Photography		Cosmopolitan	15.1				
		Mechanix	10.0	Popular	13.5				
		Illustrated		Mechanics					
				Popular Science	13.0				
				Exploring	12.7				
				Car and Driver	12.7				
				Career World	11.5				
				College Outlook	11.5				
				Mechanix	11.1				
				Illustrated					
				Road and Track	10.9				

^a Magazines read occasionally or regularly by fewer than 10% of a subgroup are not reported.

^b Regular (not Spanish) version

Table 21

Rank Order of Favorite Television Programs: ROTC Cadets

Female			Male		
Black (n=69)	Hispanic (n=31)	White (n=77)	Black (n=74)	Hispanic (n=40)	White (n=170)
Program	Program	Program	Program	Program	Program
% of Group	% of Group	% of Group	% of Group	% of Group	% of Group
Jeffersons	Eight is Enough	Mork and Mindy	Jeffersons	MASH	MASH
Diff'rent Strokes	Mork and Mindy	MASH	What's Happening	Mork and Mindy	Mork and Mindy
What's Happening	MASH	60 Minutes	Happy Days	60 Minutes	60 Minutes
Good Times	60 Minutes	Eight is Enough	MASH	Tonight Show	Battlestar
Eight is Enough	Soap	Battlestar	Mork and Mindy	Battlestar	Galactica
Family	Three's Company	Galactica	60 Minutes	Galactica	Saturday Night
White Shadow	Battlestar	Starsky and Hutch	Sports	Happy Days	Live
Soap	Galactica	Happy Days	Soap	Novies (Other) ^a	Happy Days
Mork and Mindy	Charlie's Angels	Little House on	Barney Miller	Samford and Son	Novies (Other) ^a
News	Happy Days	the Prairie	Battlestar	All in the Family	Rockford Files
Starsky and Hutch	News	Low Grant	Galactica	Bugs Bunny/Road	Sports
Love Boat	Starsky and Hutch	Love Boat	Good Times	Runner	Wide World of
One Life to Live	Vegas	Saturday Night Live	News	CBS News	Sports
All My Children	All in the Family	Novies (Other) ^a	Starsky and Hutch	Columbo	All in the Family
Barnaby Jones	Barnaby Jones	All in the Family	Three's Company	Get Smart	News
	CHIPS	Fantasy Island	White Shadow	Incredible Hulk	Soap
	Dallas	Laverne and Shirley	All in the Family	News	
	Hawaii 5-0	Quincy	6.8	Saturday Night Live	
	Police Story	Soap	6.8	Soap	
	Saturday Night Live			Starsky and Hutch	
	Mild Kingdom			White Shadow	
	Young and Restless			Wide World of	
				Sports	

Note.

Programs mentioned by fewer than 5% of the respondents in each group are not listed for that group in the table.

^a Movies (Other) includes all types of television movies mentioned except for those identifiable as prime time movies.

Table 22
Rank Order of Favorite Television Programs: Non-RMC Students

Black (n=12)			Female			White (n=131)			Black (n=26)			Hispanic (n=57)			White (n=173)		
Program	% of Group		Program	% of Group		Program	% of Group		Program	% of Group		Program	% of Group		Program	% of Group	
Diff'rent Strokes	25.0		Mork and Minda	43.4		Mork and Minda	55.7		Jeffersons	20.8		Mork and Minda	28.1		Mork and Minda	37.0	
Jeffersons	25.0		60 Minutes	24.5		NASH	24.4		Sports	16.7		60 Minutes	26.3		NASH	35.3	
Family	18.8		Family	18.9		60 Minutes	16.8		Starsky and Hutch	16.7		NASH	21.1		60 Minutes	23.7	
Mork and Minda	15.6		Love Boat	15.1		Soap	12.2		What's Happening	16.7		Saturday Night	12.3		Saturday Night	19.7	
What's Happening	15.6		NASH	13.2		Saturday Night	10.7		Diff'rent Strokes	12.5		Live	10.5		Live		
60 Minutes	12.5		Starsky and Hutch	11.3		Live	9.9		Mork and Minda	12.5		Happy Days	8.8		Happy Days	10.4	
Soap	12.5		Eight Is Enough	9.4		Eight Is Enough	9.9		Movies (Other) ^a	12.5		All in the Family	8.8		Sports	9.8	
White Shadow	12.5		Happy Days	9.4		Love Boat	9.9		News	12.5		Soap	8.8		Soap	8.7	
Starsky and Hutch	9.4		Saturday Night Live	9.4		Movies (Other) ^a	9.9		White Shadow	12.5		Sports	8.8		Movies (Other) ^a	6.9	
All My Children	6.3		Soap	9.4		Family	9.2		Hawaii 5-0	8.3		Barney Miller	7.0		Barney Miller	6.4	
Batman Jones	6.3		Three's Company	9.4		Three's Company	9.2		Good Times	8.3		Movies (Prime) ^b	7.0		News	6.4	
Barney Miller	6.3		Ballas	5.7		Happy Days	6.9		Happy Days	8.3		News	7.0		Rockford Files	6.4	
Charlie's Angels	6.3		Fantasy Island	5.7		News	6.9		NASH	8.3		Tonight Show	7.0		Starsky and Hutch	6.4	
Atlas	6.3		Jeffersons	5.7		Little House on	5.3					Barney Miller	5.3		Three's Company	6.4	
Donahue	6.3		Laverne and	5.7		the Prairie	5.3					Battletan	5.3		Tonight Show	5.8	
Eight Is Enough	6.3		Shirley	5.7		Tonight Show	5.3					Movies (Other) ^a	5.3				
Gong Show	6.3		News	5.7								Movies (Other) ^a	5.3				
Happy Days	6.3											Starsky and Hutch	5.3				
Love Boat	6.3											Three's Company	5.3				
News	6.3																
Tonight Show	6.3																
Waltons	6.3																
Young and Restless	6.3																

Note.

Programs mentioned by fewer than 5% of the respondents in each group are not listed for that group in the table.

^a Movies (Other) includes all types of television movies mentioned except for those identifiable as prime time movies.

^b Movies (Prime) includes only prime time television movies.

Table 23

Rank Order of Favorite Radio Programming: ROTC Cadets

Female			Male		
Black (n=19)	Hispanic (n=11)	White (n=77)	Black (n=74)	Hispanic (n=40)	White (n=170)
Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group
FM	43.5	FM	66.2	FM	55.0
Soul	26.1	Rock	41.6	Rock	32.5
AM	21.7	Classical	20.8	AM	17.5
Jazz	20.3	AM	19.5	Disco	17.5
Sports	15.9	Country-Western	18.2	Sports	17.5
Religious	14.5	Disco	15.6	Easy Listening	12.5
Disco	11.6	Easy Listening	10.4	Classical	10.0
News	11.6	Pop	9.1	Country-Western	8.8
Rock	10.1	Disco	9.1	Pop	7.1
Classical	7.2	Top Forty	9.1	Talk Shows	5.3
Pop	7.2	News	6.5		
Talk Shows	7.2	Top Forty	6.5		

Note.

Programming mentioned by fewer than 5% of the respondents in each group is not listed for that group in the table.

Table 24

Rank Order of Favorite Radio Programming: Non-ROTC Students

Female			Male		
Black (n=12)	Hispanic (n=51)	White (n=131)	Black (n=24)	Hispanic (n=57)	White (n=171)
Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group	Category	% of Group
Soul	46.9	FM	62.3	FM	54.4
FM	43.8	Rock	32.1	Rock	43.9
Rock	31.3	AM	18.9	AM	58.4
Classical	15.6	Disco	18.9	Disco	19.3
Jazz	15.6	Easy Listening	15.1	Soul	14.0
Religious	9.4	Classical	11.3	News	12.3
Rhythm and Blues	9.4	Country-Western	9.4	Country-Western	8.8
Country-Western	6.3	News	7.6	Sports	7.5
Disco	6.3	Sports	7.6	Easy Listening	6.9
Pop	6.3	Top Forty	5.7		
Sports	6.3				

Note.

Programming mentioned by fewer than 5% of the respondents in each group is not listed for that group in the table.

Education-Related Variables

The overall picture that emerges from analyzing the education-related variables presented in Table 25 is that sex had a significant effect on choice of college major, on high school grade average (but not college grades), and on some of the influences of people on educational plans. Ethnic background had a significant effect on choice of college major, on sources of college finance, on high school grades (for cadets primarily), and on some influences on educational plans.

The male/female differences in choice of college major followed rather traditional lines, with, for example, a higher percentage of males picking engineering and a higher percentage of females picking education. Much of the significant difference in choice of college major that can be traced to ethnic background seems to have been due to the relatively high percentage of whites in the physical sciences and white cadets in engineering, the relatively low percentage of Hispanics in business, and the relatively high percentages of blacks and Hispanics in the "Other" category.

A much higher percentage of whites than blacks or Hispanics reported that part of their college education was financed by their family, possibly reflecting the higher average family income of white respondents. Proportionately more blacks and Hispanics than whites had some type of scholarship assistance (other than ROTC), and a considerably larger percentage of Hispanics and whites than blacks worked to finance part of their college education. In general, there was quite a varied pattern of college finance sources reported by the subgroups.

Females more than males, and blacks more than Hispanics and whites reported that various other people--parents, other relatives, friends, teachers, counselors, and those in the career--had a moderate influence on their educational planning. The one exception to this trend was the influence provided by the father, and there the subgroup rating differences were generally not significant. All subgroups attributed greater influence to their mother and father than to other socializing influences, with the exception of black male cadets who attributed the greatest influence to their mother but relatively small influence to their father.

Career-Related Variables

A very large set of career-related variables is displayed in Table 26. Males and females showed a significant difference in their average expected annual salary ten years after college. Both cadet and student males expected about \$31,000 per year, and both cadet and student females expected about \$26,500 per year. Note that the effect of ethnic group on expected salary is not significant even though the three groups reported widely varying present family income. The three ethnic groups had their sights set on about the same income goal.

Males and females and the different ethnic groups showed relatively few significant differences in the careers they were considering to meet their salary goals. The significant male/female differences in first,

Table 25
Education-Related Variables

Education Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Female	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Female	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Year in School														
% Freshmen	56.8	46.3	NA ^a	55.1	52.9	48.0	NA ^a	47.8	42.1	NA ^a	44.6	29.1	50.5	NA ^a
% Sophomores	33.0	49.1	NA ^a	39.0	37.1	46.3	NA ^a	43.0	38.6	NA ^a	48.2	43.6	38.9	NA ^a
% Other	10.2	4.6	NA ^a	5.9	10.0	5.7	NA ^a	9.2	19.3	NA ^a	7.1	27.3	11.5	NA ^a
			$\chi^2(13)=50.05^{***}$				$\chi^2(26)=49.88^{**}$			$\chi^2(13)=49.75^{***}$				$\chi^2(26)=46.87^{**}$
College Major														
% Physical Science	1.7	4.6		0.7	1.4	5.7		4.6	0.8		1.8	1.8	3.0	
% Biological Science	13.6	13.1		11.2	21.1	12.2		10.6	7.1		8.9	7.3	9.2	
% Social Science	9.6	10.3		7.7	11.3	11.0		11.1	17.0		10.7	18.2	13.5	
% English and Literature	1.7	0.0		0.0	1.4	0.8		2.3	0.8		0.0	0.9	2.0	
% Education	6.2	1.8		3.5	7.0	2.4		10.6	2.0		7.1	8.2	5.0	
% Fine Arts	2.3	2.8		3.5	2.8	2.0		4.2	2.8		5.4	2.7	3.3	
% Foreign Language	1.1	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.8		1.9	0.0		0.0	0.9	1.0	
% Engineering	2.3	18.1		7.7	9.9	15.1		4.2	9.5		10.7	1.8	8.3	
% Mathematics	2.8	0.7		1.4	1.4	1.6		0.9	2.6		1.8	0.9	2.0	
% Agriculture	0.0	1.1		0.0	1.4	0.8		1.4	4.7		0.0	4.5	3.3	
% Physical Education	2.8	2.8		1.4	4.2	3.3		1.4	4.0		0.0	1.8	3.6	
% Business	24.9	24.5		30.1	12.7	24.9		21.8	25.3		25.0	17.3	25.7	
% Other	27.1	17.7		32.2	21.1	15.1		19.0	20.9		26.8	33.6	13.9	
% Don't know	4.0	2.5		0.7	4.2	4.1		6.0	2.8		1.8	0.0	6.3	
Sources of College Finance														
% Family	69.1	61.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	52.1	54.9	73.9	$\chi^2(2)=21.66^{***}$	75.0	62.1	$\chi^2(1)=8.39^{**}$	51.8	57.8	74.7	$\chi^2(2)=18.20^{***}$
% Scholarship, ROTC	6.4	14.5	$\chi^2(1)=6.30^*$	5.0	5.6	16.8	$\chi^2(2)=15.03^{***}$	1.4	1.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.6	0.9	1.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Scholarship, Other	44.0	31.2	$\chi^2(1)=7.12^{**}$	53.5	42.9	24.1	$\chi^2(2)=35.41^{***}$	36.0	38.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	44.6	51.4	31.0	$\chi^2(2)=15.61^{***}$
% Work	48.9	56.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	41.0	64.8	57.6	$\chi^2(2)=13.98^{***}$	51.6	61.9	$\chi^2(1)=4.59^*$	27.3	61.1	61.2	$\chi^2(2)=22.76^{***}$
Mean, High School Grade Average ^b	4.14	3.95	$t(458)=-2.64^{**}$	3.82	3.90	4.18	$F(2,457)=13.19^{***}$	4.28	3.94	$t(467)=-5.10^{***}$	4.00	3.95	4.17	$F(2,466)=3.90^*$
Mean, College Grade Average ^b	3.64	3.56	$t(432)=NS$	3.56	3.38	3.66	$F(2,431)=3.56^*$	3.65	3.55	$t(444)=NS$	3.62	3.42	3.67	$F(2,443)=NS$
High School Extra-curricular Activities														
% No Activities	13.6	8.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	14.0	10.0	8.1	$\chi^2(4)=16.61^{**}$	12.1	13.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	20.0	11.0	12.5	$\chi^2(4)=NS$
% One Activity	15.3	17.0		21.7	24.3	11.0		15.9	16.2		12.7	22.0	14.5	
% More than One Activity	71.0	74.9		64.3	65.7	80.9		72.0	70.0		67.3	67.0	72.9	

Table 25, continued

Education Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Test of Significance, Sex		Hispanic		White		Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe-male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
	Fe-male	Male	Black	Hispanic	White									
Mean, Influence on Educational and Career Plans Provided by c														
Father	3.26	3.34	t(454)=NS	2.94	3.54	3.46	F(2,453)=6.49**	3.44	3.41	t(465)=NS	3.04	3.49	3.48	F(2,464)=NS
Mother	3.95	3.52	t(458)=-3.49***	4.11	3.87	3.38	F(2,457)=16.03***	3.82	3.42	t(465)=-3.62***	3.95	3.90	3.44	F(2,464)=8.54***
Other Relatives	2.59	2.53	t(458)=NS	3.08	2.65	2.22	F(2,457)=20.21***	2.47	2.17	t(465)=-2.63**	2.77	2.68	2.09	F(2,464)=14.33***
Friends	2.59	2.41	t(458)=NS	2.71	2.38	2.37	F(2,457)=3.96*	2.64	2.48	t(466)=NS	2.45	2.71	2.52	F(2,465)=NS
Teachers	2.98	2.61	t(458)=-2.94**	3.13	2.93	2.48	F(2,457)=12.17***	2.85	2.39	t(466)=-4.03***	2.86	2.78	2.49	F(2,465)=3.50*
Counselors	2.35	2.29	t(457)=NS	2.79	2.44	2.00	F(2,456)=19.95***	2.31	2.00	t(466)=-2.82**	2.45	2.51	1.95	F(2,465)=11.70***
Those in the Career	3.01	2.87	t(457)=NS	3.08	2.99	2.81	F(2,456)=NS	2.82	2.55	t(466)=-2.29*	2.66	2.75	2.65	F(2,465)=NS

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

a Significance tests were not performed for differences in Sex or Ethnic Background because the sample was stratified on these variables.

b 1 = Lower than D; 2 = D; 3 = C; 4 = B; 5 = A

c 1 = Very Small Role; 5 = Very Large Role

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Table 26

Career-Related Variables

Career Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Mean, Expected Annual Salary 10 Years After College Careers Being Considered: First Choice % Engineering, Physical Science, Mathematics, Architecture % Medical and Biological Sciences % Business Administration % General Teaching and Social Service % Humanities, Law, Social and Behavioral Sciences % Fine Arts, Performing Arts % Technical Jobs % Proprietors, Sales % Mechanics, Industrial Trades % Construction Trades % Secretarial-Clerical, Office Workers % General Labor, Community and Public Service % Military Officer % Housewife % Other	4.90	5.59	t(454)=3.71***	5.42	4.90	5.40	F(2,453)=NS	4.71	5.67	t(462)=5.40***	5.52	5.05	5.24	F(2,461)=NS
	8.5	21.1	$\chi^2(1)=11.90***$	12.6	14.1	19.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	8.8	13.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	16.1	6.4	11.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	17.5	16.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	13.3	26.8	15.8	$\chi^2(2)=6.51*$	19.0	10.2	$\chi^2(1)=6.61*$	12.5	10.0	16.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	15.8 7.3	14.4 1.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=7.64**$	22.4 4.2	9.9 5.6	12.1 3.2	$\chi^2(2)=9.17*$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$	19.4 17.1	26.4 3.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=22.89***$	16.1 8.9	20.9 12.7	15.3 8.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$
	16.4	12.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	17.5	16.9	11.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	14.4	29.5	$\chi^2(1)=14.54***$	12.5	40.9	17.8	$\chi^2(2)=28.45***$
	3.4	2.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.9	1.4	2.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	4.2	3.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.4	0.9	4.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	0.6 0.6 1.1	1.4 2.8 0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$	1.4 0.7 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.2 3.2 1.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.4 1.9 0.0	1.6 1.2 1.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.4 3.6 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.3 1.6 1.0	$\chi^2(2)=7.44*$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$
	0.0 4.5	1.1 0.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=10.55**$	0.7 3.5	1.4 2.8	0.4 0.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$	0.5 3.2	1.2 0.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=6.29*$	1.8 7.1	0.0 0.0	1.0 1.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=14.39***$
	1.1	1.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	0.0	1.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	0.9	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	1.8	1.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
	10.2 5.1 7.9	19.4 0.0 4.6	$\chi^2(1)=6.25*$ $\chi^2(1)=12.19***$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$	11.2 0.0 5.6	16.9 2.8 1.4	18.2 2.8 7.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$	0.0 2.3 6.9	0.4 0.4 5.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$ $\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0 0.0 10.7	0.9 0.0 5.5	0.0 2.0 5.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$ $\chi^2(2)=NS$

Table 26, continued

Career Variables	Respondents														
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students							
	Test of Significance, Sex		Test of Significance, Ethnic Background			Test of Significance, Sex		Test of Significance, Ethnic Background			Test of Significance, Sex		Test of Significance, Ethnic Background		
	Fe- male	Male	Black	His- panic	White	Fe- male	Male	Black	His- panic	White	Fe- male	Male	Black	His- panic	White
Careers Being Considered: First, Second, or Third Choice															
% Engineering, Physical Science, Mathematics, Architecture	15.3	29.9	$\chi^2(1)=11.98^{***}$	21.7	21.1	26.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	20.8	26.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	33.9	15.5	24.7	$\chi^2(2)=7.55^*$	
% Medical and Biological Sciences	26.0	25.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	23.8	29.6	25.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	27.8	16.9	$\chi^2(1)=7.41^{**}$	19.6	19.1	23.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Business Administration	37.3	39.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	40.6	31.0	39.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	40.7	52.8	$\chi^2(1)=6.29^*$	42.9	42.7	49.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% General Teaching and Social Service	32.2	19.0	$\chi^2(1)=9.67^{**}$	30.1	28.2	19.4	$\chi^2(2)=6.37^*$	39.8	28.7	$\chi^2(1)=5.91^*$	33.9	39.1	31.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Humanities, Law, Social and Behavioral Sciences	35.6	30.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	34.3	39.4	29.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	34.3	46.5	$\chi^2(1)=6.69^{**}$	25.0	53.6	39.1	$\chi^2(2)=13.63^{**}$	
% Fine Arts, Performing Arts	10.2	8.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	12.6	8.5	7.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	13.0	11.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	8.9	8.2	13.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Technical Jobs	8.5	15.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	12.6	14.1	12.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	6.0	13.4	$\chi^2(1)=6.25^*$	16.1	6.4	10.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Proprietors, Sales	5.1	9.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.2	4.2	10.5	$\chi^2(2)=6.53^*$	15.3	20.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	19.6	9.1	21.4	$\chi^2(2)=8.24^*$	
% Mechanics, Industrial Trades	2.8	7.7	$\chi^2(1)=3.94^*$	4.2	4.2	7.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	0.5	11.4	$\chi^2(1)=21.64^{***}$	12.5	5.5	5.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Construction Trades	2.3	7.7	$\chi^2(1)=5.18^*$	4.2	5.6	6.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.9	12.2	$\chi^2(1)=16.68^{***}$	7.1	5.5	8.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Secretarial-Clerical, Office Workers	29.9	2.1	$\chi^2(1)=73.20^{***}$	22.4	8.5	8.5	$\chi^2(2)=17.05^{***}$	28.2	2.0	$\chi^2(1)=64.59^{***}$	14.3	24.5	10.2	$\chi^2(2)=13.78^{***}$	
% General Labor, Community and Public Service	7.9	10.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	11.9	9.9	8.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	9.7	15.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.1	17.3	12.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Military Officer	35.6	60.6	$\chi^2(1)=26.22^{***}$	46.2	52.1	53.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.4	6.7	$\chi^2(1)=6.81^{**}$	5.4	7.3	3.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Housewife	27.7	1.1	$\chi^2(1)=74.62^{***}$	6.3	14.1	13.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	37.0	1.2	$\chi^2(1)=100.76^{***}$	14.3	15.5	19.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
% Other	18.1	20.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	15.4	11.3	23.9	$\chi^2(2)=7.68^*$	17.6	19.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	19.6	17.3	19.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	

Table 26, continued

Career Variables	ROTC Cadet										Respondents										Non-ROTC Students														
	Test of Significance, Sex					Hispanic					White					Test of Significance, Ethnic Background					Hispanic					White					Test of Significance, Ethnic Background				
	Female	Male				Black	Hispanic	White				Black	Hispanic	White	Male				Black	Hispanic	White	Male				Black	Hispanic	White	Male						
Mean Importance of Various Job Dimensions ^b																																			
Salary	4.34	4.26	t(462)=NS			4.62	4.21	4.13	F(2,443)=1.6, 12*		4.22				4.21	t(447)=NS			4.43			4.36				4.12									
Prestige	3.94	3.99	t(458)=NS			4.12	4.21	3.81	F(2,457)=4.12*		3.91				3.99	t(468)=NS			3.86			4.22			3.87										
Responsibility	4.48	4.25	t(459)=-2.77**			4.43	4.54	4.22	F(2,458)=4.50**		4.38				4.17	t(468)=-2.69**			4.07			4.59			4.19										
Interacting People	4.56	4.25	t(459)=-3.50**			4.52	4.44	4.27	F(2,458)=5.58*		4.51				4.32	t(468)=-2.32*			4.23			4.58			4.38										
Utilization of Skills	4.46	4.21	t(458)=-2.77**			4.34	4.61	4.21	F(2,457)=5.03**		4.33				4.17	t(468)=NS			4.18			4.38			4.20										
Contribution to Society	4.07	4.05	t(457)=NS			4.13	4.32	3.94	F(2,456)=4.03*		4.00				3.91	t(468)=NS			4.18			4.18			3.82										
Geographic Resiliability	3.80	3.94	t(459)=NS			3.82	3.85	3.94	F(2,458)=NS		3.82				3.87	t(467)=NS			3.69			3.85			3.63										
More Schooling	4.07	3.95	t(459)=NS			4.19	4.20	3.83	F(2,458)=5.66**		3.85				3.80	t(467)=NS			3.96			4.28			3.63										
Stability of Home Life	4.20	4.24	t(458)=NS			4.32	4.27	4.15	F(2,457)=NS		4.35				4.18	t(468)=-1.97*			4.07			4.36			4.25										
Chance to be a Leader	4.15	4.23	t(458)=NS			4.24	4.39	4.12	F(2,457)=NS		3.62				3.91	t(468)=-2.88**			3.66			4.18			3.65										
Personal Freedom	4.48	4.41	t(458)=NS			4.43	4.60	4.10	F(2,457)=NS		4.36				4.41	t(467)=NS			4.20			4.54			4.36										
Adventure	4.34	4.10	t(458)=-2.56*			4.27	4.20	4.14	F(2,457)=NS		3.95				3.86	t(468)=NS			3.89			4.04			3.84										
Job Security	4.60	4.55	t(459)=NS			4.59	4.61	4.53	F(2,458)=NS		4.48				4.32	t(468)=NS			4.38			4.60			4.33										
Chance to Help Others	4.51	4.20	t(459)=-3.55**			4.53	4.62	4.12	F(2,458)=13.63**		4.77				1.15	t(468)=-2.54*			4.04			4.66			4.14										
Self-Improvement	4.62	4.48	t(459)=NS			4.54	4.66	4.49	F(2,458)=NS		4.57				4.38	t(468)=-2.72**			4.32			4.64			4.43										
Quality of Supervisors	4.41	4.17	t(459)=-2.45*			4.43	4.30	4.26	F(2,458)=NS		4.25				4.13	t(467)=NS			3.95			4.36			4.16										
Interesting/Challenging Job	4.57	4.51	t(459)=NS			4.49	4.58	4.55	F(2,458)=NS		4.62				4.46	t(468)=-2.16*			4.11			4.59			4.59										
Feedback on Performance	4.42	4.30	t(457)=NS			4.39	4.51	4.27	F(2,456)=NS		4.33				4.22	t(468)=NS			3.91			4.44			4.28										
Importance of Work	4.46	4.37	t(459)=NS			4.41	4.63	4.36	F(2,458)=3.24*		4.33				4.24	t(468)=NS			3.98			4.57			4.23										
Family Contentment	4.42	4.48	t(456)=NS			4.37	4.48	4.50	F(2,455)=NS		4.49				4.36	t(467)=NS			4.16			4.61			4.39										
Advancement Opportunity	4.57	4.67	t(458)=NS			4.68	4.64	4.60	F(2,457)=NS		4.38				4.43	t(465)=NS			4.13			4.68			4.36										

Table 26, continued

Career Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Mean, Expected Satis- faction in Army for Various Job Dimensions ^c														
Salary	4.04	3.79	t(433)=-2.55*	4.19	3.81	3.75	F(2,432)=9.37***	3.64	3.30	t(440)=-3.25***	3.66	3.78	3.31	F(2,439)=8.01***
Prestige	4.05	4.03	t(456)=NS	4.11	4.32	3.91	F(2,455)=5.58**	3.80	3.41	t(464)=-3.63***	3.52	3.94	3.47	F(2,463)=6.44**
Responsibility	4.42	4.32	t(456)=NS	4.47	4.47	4.27	F(2,455)=3.28*	3.98	3.72	t(464)=-2.61**	3.83	4.16	3.72	F(2,463)=7.09***
Interesting People	4.49	4.13	t(456)=-3.93***	4.50	4.31	4.14	F(2,455)=6.97***	4.05	3.64	t(464)=-3.70***	3.85	4.24	3.68	F(2,463)=9.20***
Utilization of Skills	4.35	4.00	t(456)=-3.66***	4.35	4.46	3.92	F(2,455)=13.44***	3.84	3.49	t(464)=-3.19**	3.87	3.91	3.52	F(2,463)=5.60***
Contribution to Society	4.00	3.84	t(454)=-2.30*	4.14	4.23	3.73	F(2,453)=9.53***	3.67	3.27	t(464)=-3.23***	3.70	3.85	3.27	F(2,463)=9.20***
Geographic Desirability	3.92	3.74	t(455)=NS	3.92	4.00	3.70	F(2,454)=NS	3.38	3.21	t(463)=NS	3.48	3.56	3.16	F(2,462)=4.99**
More Schooling	4.20	4.11	t(456)=NS	4.30	4.33	4.00	F(2,455)=5.27**	3.96	3.64	t(463)=-3.11**	3.87	4.00	3.69	F(2,462)=3.30*
Stability of Home Life	3.80	3.64	t(457)=NS	4.06	3.85	3.46	F(2,456)=11.46***	3.36	3.18	t(461)=NS	3.36	3.71	3.09	F(2,460)=9.84***
Chance to be a Leader	4.45	4.49	t(457)=NS	4.45	4.59	4.45	F(2,456)=NS	4.14	3.94	t(461)=-1.98*	3.94	4.26	3.97	F(2,460)=3.10*
Personal Freedom	3.88	3.68	t(457)=NS	4.21	3.92	3.45	F(2,456)=19.85***	3.38	3.15	t(460)=NS	3.49	3.87	2.99	F(2,459)=19.68***
Adventure	4.46	4.39	t(456)=NS	4.37	4.58	4.40	F(2,455)=NS	4.10	3.77	t(463)=-3.20***	4.04	4.15	3.82	F(2,462)=3.67*
Job Security	4.57	4.53	t(456)=NS	4.64	4.69	4.45	F(2,455)=3.48*	4.38	4.14	t(462)=-2.65**	4.32	4.40	4.19	F(2,461)=NS
Chance to Help Others	4.46	4.18	t(455)=-3.29***	4.53	4.49	4.10	F(2,454)=13.48***	3.91	3.56	t(463)=-3.17**	3.83	4.07	3.57	F(2,462)=7.45***
Self-Improvement	4.61	4.34	t(455)=-3.39***	4.58	4.51	4.32	F(2,454)=6.50**	4.12	3.72	t(463)=-3.79***	4.04	4.14	3.79	F(2,462)=4.13*
Quality of Supervisors	4.35	4.10	t(454)=-2.64**	4.37	4.40	4.04	F(2,453)=7.43***	3.87	3.45	t(461)=-3.64***	3.61	3.96	3.54	F(2,460)=4.77**
Interesting/Challenging Job	4.41	4.24	t(456)=NS	4.40	4.56	4.17	F(2,455)=6.25**	3.90	3.48	t(462)=-3.68***	3.80	3.95	3.55	F(2,461)=4.33*
Feedback on Performance	4.35	4.24	t(454)=NS	4.38	4.50	4.17	F(2,453)=5.27**	3.98	3.70	t(462)=-2.82**	3.94	4.01	3.74	F(2,461)=NS
Importance of Work	4.38	4.24	t(456)=NS	4.38	4.60	4.16	F(2,455)=7.53***	3.88	3.44	t(463)=-4.09***	3.67	3.91	3.54	F(2,462)=4.07*
Family Contentment	4.05	3.95	t(456)=NS	4.12	4.23	3.85	F(2,455)=5.25**	3.65	3.36	t(462)=-2.32*	3.65	3.81	3.35	F(2,461)=5.07**
Advancement Opportunity	4.62	4.46	t(455)=-2.06*	4.62	4.70	4.41	F(2,454)=5.30**	4.19	4.06	t(460)=NS	4.10	4.30	4.05	F(2,459)=NS

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

a 1 = Under \$10,000; 4 = \$20,000 to \$24,999; 5 = \$25,000 to \$29,999; 8 = Over \$40,000

b j = Not Important At All; 5 = Very Important

c 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 5 = Very Satisfied

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

second, and third career choices combined in Table 26 follow rather traditional lines. Since fewer male/female differences reached significance when first career choice alone was examined, it may indicate that many females preferred a non-traditional career, but would settle for a more traditional one if need be. Note that a significantly higher percentage of male than female cadets (60% vs 35%) stated that they were considering a military career as one of their top three choices.

There were significant sex and especially ethnic background differences in ratings of the importance of various job dimensions and the potential for satisfaction of these dimensions by an Army officer career. Females tended to assign slightly higher importance ratings to the dimensions than did males. When the male/female differences in potential satisfaction by the Army were examined, females much more often gave a significantly higher rating than males, especially for the non-ROTC student group. The implication is that females in general were looking for about the same things in a career as males, but they saw the Army as offering more potential for satisfaction than did males.

Data in Table 26 also show that Hispanics, and occasionally blacks, looked for more in a career than whites and saw the Army as having greater potential to meet these desires than did whites. Of the three ethnic groups, whites almost always gave the lowest ratings to the potential satisfaction of important job dimensions in the Army.

The emerging pattern from these data parallels the cadet/student differences discussed earlier. The traditional minority groups--females, blacks, and Hispanics--have their sights set on about the same career goals as white males; however, they see the Army as providing a better opportunity to meet these goals than do white males.

A rank ordering of the three most important job dimensions and the three least important job dimensions for each subgroup is presented in Table 27. The table also shows the three dimensions expected to be most satisfied in the Army, and the three dimensions expected to be least satisfied by the various subgroups. An inspection of the listings reveals that the three most important job dimensions overlapped with those dimensions expected to be most satisfied in the Army more than twice as often for cadets as for students. Cadets expected that being an Army officer would satisfy the dimensions they were looking for in a job. Note also from the table that no subgroup other than the white cadets perceived Chance to be a Leader as the most satisfying dimension in an Army officer career. This may be attributable to the fact that proportionately more whites than blacks or Hispanics presently succeed in making it up the officer career ladder.

Knowledge of ROTC and the Army

The pattern that emerges from the data concerning knowledge about ROTC and the Army presented in Table 28 is that, generally, sex and ethnic background have a minor effect. There was a tendency for relatively more males to have stated that they knew more about ROTC, for proportionately more males to have become aware of ROTC and the scholarship program earlier, and for a higher percentage of males to have answered the knowledge test correctly.

Table 27

Rank Ordering of the Three Most and Three Least Important Job Dimensions
and the Three Dimensions Most and Least Expected to be Satisfied in the Army

Job Dimension:	ROTC Cadets					
	Female	Male	Black	Hispanic	White	
Most Important	Utilization of Skills	Advancement Opportunity	Advancement Opportunity	Self-Improvement	Advancement Opportunity	
2nd Most Important	Self-Improvement	Job Security	Salary	Advancement Opportunity	Challenging Job	
3rd Most Important	Job Security	Challenging Job	Job Security	Job Security	Job Security	
3rd Least Important	More Schooling	Prestige	Contribution to Society	More Schooling	Geographic Desirability	
2nd Least Important	Prestige	More Schooling	Prestige	Adventure	More Schooling	
Least Important	Geographic Desirability	Geographic Desirability	Geographic Desirability	Geographic Desirability	Prestige	
Most Satisfied in Army	Advancement Opportunity	Job Security	Job Security	Advancement Opportunity	Chance to be a Leader	
2nd Most Satisfied	Self-Improvement	Chance to be a Leader	Advancement Opportunity	Job Security	Job Security	
3rd Most Satisfied	Job Security	Advancement Opportunity	Self-Improvement	Self-Improvement	Advancement Opportunity	
3rd Least Satisfied	Geographic Desirability	Geographic Desirability	Prestige	Personal Freedom	Geographic Desirability	
2nd Least Satisfied	Personal Freedom	Personal Freedom	Stability of Home Life	Stability of Home Life	Stability of Home Life	
Least Satisfied in Army	Stability of Home Life	Stability of Home Life	Geographic Desirability	Salary	Personal Freedom	

Job Dimension:	Non-ROTC Students					
	Female	Male	Black	Hispanic	White	
Most Important	Challenging Job	Challenging Job	Salary	Advancement Opportunity	Challenging Job	
2nd Most Important	Self-Improvement	Advancement	Job Security	Chance to Help Others	Self-Improvement	
3rd Most Important	Interesting People	Personal Freedom	Self-Improvement	Self-Improvement	Family Contentment	
3rd Least Important	More Schooling	Geographic Desirability	Prestige	Contribution to Society	Contribution to Society	
2nd Least Important	Geographic Desirability	Adventure	Geographic Desirability	Adventure	Chance to be a Leader	
Least Important	Chance to be a Leader	More Schooling	Chance to be a Leader	Geographic Desirability	More Schooling	
Most Satisfied in Army	Job Security	Job Security	Job Security	Job Security	Job Security	
2nd Most Satisfied	Advancement Opportunity	Advancement Opportunity	Advancement Opportunity	Advancement Opportunity	Advancement Opportunity	
3rd Most Satisfied	Chance to be a Leader	Chance to be a Leader	Self-Improvement	Chance to be a Leader	Chance to be a Leader	
3rd Least Satisfied	Personal Freedom	Geographic Desirability	Personal Freedom	Salary	Geographic Desirability	
2nd Least Satisfied	Geographic Desirability	Stability of Home Life	Geographic Desirability	Stability of Home Life	Stability of Home Life	
Least Satisfied in Army	Stability of Home Life	Personal Freedom	Stability of Home Life	Geographic Desirability	Personal Freedom	

Table 28

Knowledge of ROTC and the Army

ROTC/Army Information Variables	Respondents														
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students							
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	
Self-Reported ROTC Knowledge	8.0	4.2	$\chi^2(2)=13.92***$	6.3	9.9	4.1	$\chi^2(4)=NS$	47.7	35.0	$\chi^2(2)=13.42**$	46.4	33.6	42.4	$\chi^2(4)=NS$	
	63.6	50.5		60.6	54.9	52.8		49.1	54.7		44.6	59.1	51.0		
	28.4	45.2		33.1	35.2	43.1		3.2	10.2		8.9	7.3	6.6		
Time of First Awareness of ROTC	13.6	15.2	$\chi^2(2)=7.43*$	11.2	20.6	15.0	$\chi^2(4)=NS$	14.0	18.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	22.6	20.9	14.0	$\chi^2(4)=NS$	
	59.1	68.1		66.4	52.9	66.8		71.2	67.1		60.4	62.7	72.8		
	27.3	16.7		22.4	26.5	18.2		14.9	14.1		17.0	16.4	13.3		
χ Never Heard of ROTC.	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0		
	Sources of Awareness of ROTC	32.4	48.4	$\chi^2(1)=10.77***$	37.1	33.8	47.8	$\chi^2(2)=6.70*$	29.6	35.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	29.1	31.8	33.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
		67.8	58.5		69.2	64.8	57.1		65.3	63.6		67.9	74.5	60.1	
42.0		45.8	45.5		40.8	44.7	50.9		45.3	51.8		53.6	45.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
71.6		66.2	74.8		73.2	63.0	62.5		63.6	73.2		70.9	58.4	$\chi^2(2)=8.20*$	
78.5		66.9	77.6		73.2	67.2	49.1		56.1	58.9		62.7	48.2	$\chi^2(2)=7.78*$	
49.1		55.6	61.5		52.1	48.6	40.7		40.3	46.4		51.8	35.3	$\chi^2(2)=10.05**$	
69.9		68.7	80.4		66.2	63.4	63.7		61.3	69.6		64.5	60.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
52.8		41.9	65.0		39.4	37.0	59.3		55.7	58.9		52.7	58.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
51.7		46.3	61.3		43.7	42.3	62.5		54.9	60.7		60.9	57.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
42.0		51.8	58.7		45.1	42.7	28.7		30.4	46.4		34.5	24.8	$\chi^2(2)=12.31**$	
36.2		46.6	43.7		51.4	39.6	22.7		30.2	33.9		32.7	23.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
Time of First Awareness of ROTC Scholarship Program					$\chi^2(3)=14.34**$					$\chi^2(6)=21.06**$				$\chi^2(3)=NS$	
	2.0	2.5	2.1	0.0		3.6	1.9	4.3	5.5		2.7	3.0			
	60.1	57.7	45.5	47.3		54.7	53.7	58.1	47.3		41.8	62.6			
	52.5	37.7	49.0	47.8		40.9	32.4	26.5	36.4		40.9	23.7			
	4.5	2.1	3.5	4.9		0.8	12.0	11.1	10.9		14.5	10.5			

Table 28, continued

ROTC/Army Information Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe-male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe-male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Sources of Awareness of ROTC Scholarship Program														
% Family	22.2	30.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	20.3	22.5	32.5	$\chi^2(2)=7.76^*$	15.4	21.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	20.4	10.1	21.5	$\chi^2(2)=6.99^*$
% Friends	49.4	36.6	$\chi^2(1)=6.83^{**}$	46.9	52.1	35.4	$\chi^2(2)=8.79^*$	36.9	39.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	48.1	41.8	35.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	44.3	43.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	46.9	47.9	41.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	44.9	40.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	42.6	43.6	42.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Recruiters	69.9	64.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	67.8	76.1	62.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	58.6	56.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	70.4	65.5	52.3	$\chi^2(2)=9.83^*$
% ROTC Personnel	80.2	72.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	78.3	73.2	74.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	41.9	47.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	52.7	57.3	39.3	$\chi^2(2)=12.03^{**}$
% Military Personnel	42.0	48.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	54.5	40.8	43.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	28.8	30.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	38.2	44.5	22.5	$\chi^2(2)=21.03^{***}$
% Pamphlets	56.3	60.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	66.4	60.6	54.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	49.3	49.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	41.8	48.2	51.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Radio/TV	33.0	34.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	51.7	28.2	24.8	$\chi^2(2)=30.55^{***}$	42.3	38.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	41.8	41.8	39.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Magazine/Newspaper Ads	35.2	36.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	46.2	35.2	30.1	$\chi^2(2)=10.17^{**}$	42.3	41.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	40.0	45.5	40.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Personal Reading	35.8	39.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	51.0	36.6	30.5	$\chi^2(2)=16.31^{***}$	18.6	23.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	29.1	28.2	17.5	$\chi^2(2)=7.60^*$
% Other Sources	25.6	27.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	25.2	42.3	23.6	$\chi^2(2)=10.10^{**}$	14.0	24.6	$\chi^2(1)=7.66^{**}$	27.3	26.4	15.9	$\chi^2(2)=7.85^*$
Percent of Respondents Answering Correctly on ROTC/Army Information Test														
Graduating from ROTC means that you have to serve four years of active duty in the Army.	60.5	68.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	57.2	63.8	70.8	$\chi^2(2)=7.26^*$	44.3	48.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	44.2	52.3	44.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
ROTC pays all cadets \$100 per month during the freshman and sophomore years of college.	87.4	87.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	88.7	87.1	86.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	61.0	56.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	62.5	59.6	57.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
ROTC pays all cadets \$100 per month during the junior and senior years of college.	80.6	85.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	83.0	84.3	84.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	72.0	71.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	69.1	70.0	73.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
ROTC is available for both men and women.	98.3	98.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	98.6	98.6	98.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	99.5	96.0	$\chi^2(1)=4.73^*$	94.5	99.1	97.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
ROTC scholarships are available for each college year.	80.6	85.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	73.8	84.3	89.4	$\chi^2(2)=16.24^{***}$	87.4	82.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	89.1	81.8	85.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
It is possible to join the last two years of ROTC without attending the first two.	67.0	77.2	$\chi^2(1)=5.22^*$	59.9	63.8	83.7	$\chi^2(2)=30.01^{***}$	55.9	71.4	$\chi^2(1)=11.51^{***}$	62.5	69.1	62.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$

Table 2B, continued

RUTC/Army Information Variable	Respondents													
	RUTC Cadets						Non-RUTC Students							
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Mis- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Mis- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Percent of Respondents Answering Correctly on RUTC/Army Information Test (cont.)	84.7	85.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	73.2	87.1	91.9	$\chi^2(2)=25.23***$	54.0	55.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	30.9	49.1	61.3	$\chi^2(2)=19.29***$
RUTC requires attending a summer camp each year of college.	83.0	83.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	79.6	82.9	85.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	76.5	68.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	66.1	68.2	74.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
Some RUTC graduates fulfill most of their Army Obligation in the Reserves.	74.1	80.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	69.5	75.7	84.1	$\chi^2(2)=11.51**$	59.4	69.4	$\chi^2(1)=4.63*$	50.0	64.5	67.1	$\chi^2(2)=6.55*$
The starting base pay for an Army officer is over \$700 per month.	47.7	64.9	$\chi^2(1)=12.44***$	38.7	54.3	70.7	$\chi^2(2)=38.47***$	36.4	42.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	44.6	41.8	37.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
All officers must serve at least 4 years active duty.	54.3	54.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	45.8	58.0	58.4	$\chi^2(2)=6.21*$	46.9	44.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	47.3	44.5	45.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
Officers can retire after 15 years duty at one-half of their pay.	91.5	89.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	88.7	90.0	91.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	89.3	85.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	78.6	88.2	88.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
Post-graduate schooling is available to officers while in the Army.	72.2	84.0	$\chi^2(1)=8.67**$	66.2	78.6	87.4	$\chi^2(2)=24.85***$	59.6	67.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	47.3	58.2	68.9	$\chi^2(2)=11.37**$
All officers must serve in the infantry for at least one year.	72.7	77.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	71.8	70.0	79.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	68.5	75.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	69.6	63.6	76.3	$\chi^2(2)=6.78*$
After an obligated duty period, officers may rejoin from the Army at any time.	44.9	55.9	$\chi^2(1)=6.80*$	45.1	37.1	59.6	$\chi^2(2)=14.55***$	33.3	38.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	30.9	36.7	36.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
Officers receive a maximum of 20 days paid vacation per year.	33.00	34.23	$t(456)=6.49***$	32.60	34.22	34.58	$F(2,455)=24.43***$	31.07	31.53	$t(465)=NS$	30.50	31.29	31.48	$F(2,464)=3.26*$
Mean, Total Score on RUTC/Army Information Scale														

Note.The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

There was also a significant tendency for relatively more black than Hispanic or white cadets to have become aware of ROTC and the scholarship program from media presentations--pamphlets, radio and TV, magazine and newspaper ads, and personal reading. When there was a significant difference in the percentages of the ethnic groups correctly answering a knowledge test item, the whites generally did better.

Army and ROTC Variables

The final table in this section presents a set of variables concerning various aspects of ROTC and the Army. The variables are concerned with the decision regarding whether or not to participate in ROTC, the influences on this decision, the attractiveness of various aspects of ROTC and the Army, and feelings about military service. It can be seen in Table 29 that once again females and Hispanics found ROTC and the Army more attractive than did males or blacks and whites.

Males in the sample were no more likely than females to have attended a high school with an ROTC program or to have participated in that program. Thus the higher ratings given to ROTC and the Army by college females that will be discussed later could not have been due to more females having had high school ROTC experience. A higher percentage of Hispanic college ROTC cadets participated in high school ROTC, possibly because the percentage of Hispanics attending a high school with an Army ROTC program was twice as high as that for blacks or whites.

Neither sex nor ethnic background had a particularly pronounced effect on the attractiveness ratings of aspects of high school ROTC, or on the important influences on the decision whether or not to join college ROTC. A higher percentage of female than male cadets reported that friends and ROTC recruiters and instructors were among the top three influences on their decision to join college ROTC. A higher percentage of male cadets reported that their family or the job market was an important influence. It is interesting to note that only a relatively low percentage of the respondents in any subgroup reported that the job market was one of the top three influences on their decision whether or not to join ROTC. This finding possibly reflects the generally healthy civilian job market at the time the survey was conducted (early 1979). Many alternate careers were perhaps perceived as being available.

It can also be noted in Table 29 that no subgroup had a substantial percentage reporting that media were one of the top three direct influences on their decision to join or not join ROTC. Further, it can be seen that not a single black student reported that career goals were the most important influence keeping him or her from joining ROTC. Since rather substantial percentages of Hispanic and white students reported so, this may imply that the black students were somewhat less future oriented, and had given less thought to assessing ROTC and the Army in terms of a career.

Rather strong male/female and ethnic group differences were apparent in the attractiveness ratings of various aspects of college ROTC and the Army. When the differences between males and females reached significance, the females always gave a higher mean rating. When the differences among

Table 29

Variables Relating to the Army and ROTC

Army/ROTC Variables	Respondents														
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students							
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	
Percent of Respondents for which Various High School ROTC Programs Were Available	27.7	25.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	29.4	49.3	18.2	$\chi^2(2)=28.27***$	26.9	32.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	26.8	45.9	25.0	$\chi^2(2)=16.95***$	
	4.0	6.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.6	2.8	6.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	10.6	13.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.1	13.6	12.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	9.6	8.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	14.0	8.5	5.7	$\chi^2(2)=7.91*$	14.4	9.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	12.5	10.1	12.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
			$\chi^2(4)=NS$				$\chi^2(8)=50.32***$							$\chi^2(8)=31.31***$	
Percent of Respondents Participating in High School ROTC	4.5	2.5		7.0	0.0	2.0		0.9	2.0		3.7	1.8	1.0		
	1.7	2.8		3.5	2.8	1.6		1.4	4.0		3.7	8.3	0.7		
	6.2	2.8		2.8	11.3	2.8		0.5	1.2		0.0	1.8	0.7		
	2.8	7.4		2.1	18.3	4.1		0.5	0.4		0.0	0.9	0.3		
Not Participating Although ROTC Available	19.8	17.7		21.7	25.4	14.6		31.1	36.8		22.2	48.6	31.1		
Mean Attractiveness of Various Aspects of High School ROTC	3.19	3.13	$t(134)=NS$	3.55	4.15	2.84	$F(2,133)=3.30*$	2.48	2.58	$t(153)=NS$	2.90	2.93	2.26	$F(2,152)=5.93**$	
	3.40	3.34	$t(134)=NS$	3.48	3.67	3.06	$F(2,133)=3.21*$	3.17	2.88	$t(151)=NS$	3.40	3.13	2.88	$F(2,150)=NS$	
	3.25	3.08	$t(134)=NS$	3.29	3.26	2.95	$F(2,133)=NS$	2.65	2.55	$t(152)=NS$	2.70	2.85	2.42	$F(2,151)=NS$	
	3.44	3.35	$t(134)=NS$	3.52	3.41	3.25	$F(2,133)=NS$	2.75	2.60	$t(153)=NS$	2.50	2.89	2.53	$F(2,152)=NS$	
Program Environment	3.44	3.30	$t(134)=NS$	3.50	3.54	3.09	$F(2,133)=NS$	2.63	2.38	$t(153)=NS$	2.60	2.74	2.31	$F(2,152)=NS$	
	3.42	3.48	$t(134)=NS$	3.51	3.82	3.15	$F(2,133)=NS$	3.10	2.87	$t(151)=NS$	3.30	3.27	2.73	$F(2,150)=3.38*$	
ROTC Instructors	3.48	3.24	$t(134)=NS$	3.61	3.46	3.00	$F(2,133)=NS$	2.76	2.49	$t(152)=NS$	3.10	2.95	2.33	$F(2,151)=5.06**$	
Influences on ROTC Participation Decision: Most Important	12.0	20.3	$\chi^2(1)=4.65*$	14.0	10.1	20.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	5.3	12.7	$\chi^2(1)=6.25*$	15.4	9.7	8.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	19.4	7.5	$\chi^2(1)=13.43***$	10.5	18.8	11.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	14.4	16.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	15.9	17.2	14.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	1.7	2.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	1.4	2.9	2.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.5	2.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.5	2.2	1.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	18.9	9.6	$\chi^2(1)=7.28**$	23.1	13.0	7.4	$\chi^2(2)=19.45***$	6.7	5.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	9.1	9.7	4.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	10.9	9.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	7.7	13.0	10.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.0	1.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	3.2	0.4	$\chi^2(2)=6.14*$	
	1.1	2.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	1.4	2.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.0	1.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	2.2	1.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	2.9	1.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	0.0	2.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.5	0.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.5	0.0	0.8	$\chi^2(2)=6.70*$	
	1.1	3.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	1.4	2.9	3.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	2.1	2.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	3.2	2.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	3.6	4.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.2	7.2	2.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	11.8	11.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	15.9	10.8	11.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	15.4	18.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	14.0	20.3	18.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	27.2	29.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	34.1	22.6	29.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	4.0	6.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.9	4.3	6.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	7.2	3.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	6.8	6.5	4.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	9.1	11.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	14.7	5.8	9.8	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	17.9	14.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	16.1	18.6	$\chi^2(2)=9.69**$	
	0.0	0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	0.0	0.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	1.5	1.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.1	1.1	1.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	
	0.0	0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	0.0	0.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	6.2	7.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	6.8	5.4	7.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	

Table 29, continued

Army/ROTC Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Mis- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Mis- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Influences on ROTC Participation Decision: First, Second, or Third Most Important														
% Family	25.1	36.9	$\chi^2(1)=6.27^*$	23.1	27.5	39.2	$\chi^2(2)=11.57^{**}$	20.4	28.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	23.1	24.3	25.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Friends	43.4	29.4	$\chi^2(1)=8.72^{**}$	34.3	43.5	32.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	32.0	35.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	23.1	37.9	34.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	10.9	11.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	6.3	14.5	13.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	5.3	7.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	11.5	8.7	4.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Recruiters	34.3	23.4	$\chi^2(1)=5.87^*$	35.7	33.3	21.2	$\chi^2(2)=10.78^{**}$	16.0	11.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	21.2	15.5	11.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Instructors	45.7	29.1	$\chi^2(1)=12.34^{***}$	36.4	40.6	33.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	10.2	5.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	9.6	13.6	4.9	$\chi^2(2)=8.7^*$
% Military Personnel	10.3	14.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	14.7	13.0	11.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	7.3	6.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.8	8.7	6.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Media Advertisements	11.4	7.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	14.0	4.3	6.9	$\chi^2(2)=7.59^*$	5.3	3.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.8	2.9	4.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Job Market	5.1	14.2	$\chi^2(1)=8.30^{**}$	8.4	5.8	13.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	5.3	11.9	$\chi^2(1)=5.04^*$	9.6	10.7	8.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Military Lifestyle	14.9	17.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	16.7	14.5	17.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	34.5	35.2	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	32.7	30.1	36.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Personal Beliefs	38.9	43.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	38.5	42.0	43.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	48.5	50.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	46.2	40.8	53.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Educational Goals	20.0	25.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	27.3	20.3	22.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	28.2	22.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	13.5	31.1	24.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Career Goals	33.1	39.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	37.1	26.1	39.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	45.1	41.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	34.6	36.9	47.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Unit Requirements	3.4	3.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	4.9	4.3	2.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	10.7	8.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	13.5	11.7	8.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Obligated Service	2.3	3.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	2.8	5.8	2.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$	20.4	27.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	19.2	18.4	23.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
Mean Attractiveness of College ROTC														
Image of Program	3.87	3.65	$t(456)=-2.24^*$	3.98	3.97	3.53	$F(2,455)=10.96^{***}$	3.00	2.66	$t(457)=-3.20^{***}$	3.23	3.14	2.62	$F(2,456)=13.93^{***}$
Quality of Program	4.21	4.00	$t(457)=-2.37^*$	4.21	4.19	3.97	$F(2,456)=3.78^*$	3.40	3.00	$t(454)=-4.33^{***}$	3.38	3.37	3.07	$F(2,453)=4.65^{**}$
Program Requirements	3.92	3.62	$t(457)=-3.42^{***}$	3.93	3.91	3.56	$F(2,456)=9.19^{***}$	2.91	2.69	$t(455)=-2.28^*$	3.04	3.09	2.63	$F(2,454)=10.14^{***}$
Program Activities	4.30	4.03	$t(457)=-3.07^{**}$	4.16	4.44	4.02	$F(2,456)=5.54^{**}$	3.27	2.82	$t(455)=-4.39^{***}$	3.29	3.41	2.84	$F(2,454)=12.99^{***}$
Program Environment	4.10	3.81	$t(457)=-3.18^{**}$	4.01	4.14	3.80	$F(2,456)=4.33^*$	3.09	2.63	$t(455)=-4.57^{***}$	3.02	3.28	2.64	$F(2,454)=15.23^{***}$
ROTC Instructors	4.40	4.21	$t(457)=-2.24^*$	4.22	4.43	4.27	$F(2,456)=NS$	3.25	2.80	$t(452)=-4.57^{***}$	2.93	3.48	2.84	$F(2,451)=14.39^{***}$
ROTC Cadets	3.81	3.50	$t(457)=-3.09^{**}$	3.80	3.73	3.49	$F(2,456)=4.36^*$	3.33	2.69	$t(455)=-4.53^{***}$	2.95	3.14	2.79	$F(2,454)=4.32^*$
Obligated Service	3.55	3.29	$t(457)=-2.39^*$	3.66	3.49	3.21	$F(2,456)=8.05^{***}$	2.54	2.28	$t(454)=-2.51^*$	2.68	2.83	2.18	$F(2,453)=16.47^{***}$
Scholarship Program	4.11	4.03	$t(456)=NS$	4.15	4.07	4.00	$F(2,455)=NS$	3.83	3.52	$t(453)=-2.87^{**}$	3.53	3.70	3.67	$F(2,452)=NS$
Guaranteed Job	4.10	4.17	$t(457)=NS$	4.20	4.14	4.11	$F(2,456)=NS$	3.81	3.31	$t(455)=-4.21^{***}$	3.55	3.65	3.50	$F(2,454)=NS$

Table 29, continued

Army/ROTC Variables	Respondents													
	ROTC Cadets							Non-ROTC Students						
	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background	Fe- male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	His- panic	White	Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
Heard, Attractiveness of Various Aspects of the Army ^a														
Intent to Join ROTC if Guaranteed Subsequent Reserve or National Guard Service ^b														
Intent to Join Army Without Having Participated in ROTC ^b														

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

a 1 = Very Unattractive; 5 = Very Attractive

b 1 = Indifferently Not; 5 = Definitely

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

the ethnic groups reached significance, Hispanics provided the highest attractiveness rating in most cases with blacks highest on the remainder. In every significant case but two, whites provided the lowest mean rating. Again, the most attractive aspects of ROTC and the Army were practical considerations--ROTC instructors, the ROTC scholarship program, ROTC leading to a guaranteed job, job security in the Army, Army pay and benefits, Army officer quality, and officer responsibilities. Females, Hispanics, and blacks saw these aspects as especially attractive.

All respondents were asked about their feelings toward military service. As discussed in Section 1, there were significant differences between ROTC cadets and non-ROTC students on this variable. As displayed in Table 27, there also were significant differences between males and females, and among the three ethnic groups. Proportionately more cadet and student males than females reported that they felt a duty to serve in the military. Relatively more cadet and student females than males reported that they had not given much thought to military service. Hispanic cadets appeared somewhat different from blacks or whites in that a lower percentage reported that they would not serve in the military even if called, but a lower percentage also reported they felt a duty to serve. This pattern was apparent for Hispanic students as well. It appears that the greater attractiveness of ROTC and the Army to females, blacks, and Hispanics is not due to a heightened sense of patriotism. Males and whites reported an equal, if not greater, willingness to serve. Less idealistic considerations, such as practical evaluations of opportunities inside vs outside military service, appear to be operating.

Non-ROTC students were asked two additional questions about ROTC and the Army; the results are reported at the bottom of Table 29. The students were first asked if they would have joined ROTC if they were guaranteed Army Reserve or National Guard (as opposed to Regular Army) service. They were then asked if they would consider joining the Army after college without having gone through ROTC. The mean of responses to both questions was between the "Probably Not" and "Don't Know" options for all subgroups of students. There were no significant male/female differences in response to either question, but the ethnic group differences were significant. Hispanics gave the least negative ratings while whites gave the most negative. Guaranteed Army Reserve or National Guard service may help make ROTC more attractive to Hispanic and black college students; also, more Hispanics and blacks would consider joining the Army directly out of college, without having gone through college ROTC.

Section 3. ROTC Cadets: Military Career Plans and Career Commitment

ROTC cadets were asked a series of questions concerning their military career plans and their career commitment related attitudes. Responses from 365 ROTC Basic Course cadets were analyzed for this series of questions; results are shown in Tables 30 and 31 separately for males vs females, and for blacks vs Hispanics vs whites.

The military career plans and alternatives of the cadets are presented in Table 30. The various subgroups of cadets looked very much alike on the

Table 30

ROTC Cadets: Military Career Plans and Alternatives

Career Variables	ROTC Cadets						Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
	Fe-male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	
<u>When Decided to join ROTC</u>			$\chi^2(4)=NS$				$\chi^2(8)=NS$
% Sophomore Year	0.8	1.3		0.9	0.0	1.5	
% Freshman Year	23.0	25.1		18.5	28.3	26.4	
% Summer Before College	7.9	15.1		9.3	6.7	16.2	
% High School	51.6	47.3		55.6	48.3	45.2	
% Grade School	16.7	11.3		15.7	16.7	10.7	
<u>Effect on Advanced Course Decision of Guaranteed Reserve or National Guard Service</u>			$\chi^2(2)=NS$				$\chi^2(4)=NS$
% Increased Likelihood for Advanced Course	27.4	25.7		34.0	20.0	24.1	
% No Effect	58.9	61.2		57.5	61.7	61.5	
% Decreased Likelihood for Advanced Course	13.7	13.1		8.5	18.3	14.4	
<u>Influences on Advanced Course Decision: Most Important</u>							
% Family	20.0	26.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	26.2	25.4	23.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Friends	6.4	3.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.6	6.8	2.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	0.8	0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.9	1.7	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Recruiters	4.8	3.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	8.4	0.0	2.0	$\chi^2(2)=10.74^{**}$
% ROTC Instructors	6.4	6.3	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	10.3	5.1	4.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Military Personnel	0.0	0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	0.0	0.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Media Advertisements	0.8	0.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.9	0.0	0.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Job Market	4.8	3.0	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.6	3.4	2.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Military Lifestyle	3.2	3.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	3.7	1.7	4.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Personal Beliefs	27.2	19.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	15.0	32.2	23.5	$\chi^2(2)=6.81^*$
% Educational Goals	6.4	8.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	6.5	8.5	8.7	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Career Goals	10.4	19.0	$\chi^2(1)=3.87^*$	13.1	10.2	19.4	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Unit Requirements	0.8	0.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	1.9	0.0	0.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Program Environment	0.0	1.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	0.0	1.7	1.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Obligated Service	8.0	3.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	1.9	3.4	7.1	$\chi^2(2)=NS$

Table 30, continued

Career Variables	ROTC Cadets						Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
	Female	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	
<u>Influences on Advanced Course Decision: First, Second, or Third Most Important</u>							
% Family	40.8	44.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	37.4	49.2	44.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Friends	22.4	20.7	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	20.6	23.7	20.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Teachers/Counselors	5.6	5.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	10.3	10.2	1.5	$\chi^2(2)=13.07^{**}$
% ROTC Recruiters	16.8	10.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	20.6	13.6	7.7	$\chi^2(2)=10.68^{**}$
% ROTC Instructors	25.6	23.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	26.2	25.4	23.0	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Military Personnel	5.6	5.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	9.3	6.8	2.6	$\chi^2(2)=6.76^*$
% Media Advertisements	1.6	0.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	1.9	0.0	0.5	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Job Market	14.4	16.5	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	15.9	10.2	17.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Military Lifestyle	18.4	19.4	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	15.9	15.3	21.9	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Personal Beliefs	46.4	43.9	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	34.6	57.6	46.4	$\chi^2(2)=8.66^*$
% Educational Goals	25.6	30.8	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	31.8	28.8	27.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% Career Goals	46.4	53.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	43.9	42.4	57.7	$\chi^2(2)=7.37^*$
% ROTC Unit Requirements	6.4	5.1	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	8.4	6.8	3.6	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Program Environment	6.4	7.6	$\chi^2(1)=NS$	5.6	3.4	9.2	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
% ROTC Obligated Service	16.8	8.4	$\chi^2(1)=4.89^*$	8.4	6.8	14.3	$\chi^2(2)=NS$
<u>Type of Army Service Planned</u>			$\chi^2(6)=NS$				$\chi^2(12)=26.74^{**}$
% Leaning Toward Active Duty Training	7.3	8.1		9.5	5.1	7.7	
% Active Duty Training, Definitely	8.9	9.4		10.5	6.8	9.2	
% Leaning Toward Active Duty Reserve	13.7	9.8		16.2	6.8	9.7	
% Active Duty Reserve, Definitely	4.0	6.4		1.9	11.9	5.6	
% Leaning Toward Regular Army	8.1	15.3		10.5	11.9	14.4	
% Regular Army, Definitely	16.1	23.0		9.5	22.0	26.2	
% Don't Know	41.9	28.1		41.9	35.6	27.2	
<u>Hope for ROTC Scholarship</u>			$\chi^2(2)=7.94^*$				$\chi^2(4)=20.52^{***}$
% Yes	44.0	50.4		59.4	57.6	39.3	
% No	47.2	33.5		34.9	35.6	40.8	
% Already Have ROTC Scholarship	8.8	16.1		5.7	6.8	19.9	

Note.

The number in parentheses following the χ^2 statistic is the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 was evaluated.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

variables presented: there were relatively few significant differences between males and females, or among cadets of different ethnic backgrounds. Because of this, the remainder of this discussion concerning data in the table will focus on the cadets as a group, with only an occasional reference to a subgroup value.

The majority of the cadets decided to join ROTC in high school or in their freshman year in college. Only about 13% of the cadets decided to join prior to entering high school.

The Basic Course cadets were asked about their intention to continue in ROTC, and about the influences on their decision concerning enrolling in the Advanced Course. The "intent to continue" data presented in Table 31 show a very strong sex effect. A much higher percentage of males than females intended to go through the Advanced Course (60% vs 40%, approximately) and a higher percentage of females than males stated they would not continue in ROTC next year (25% vs 12%, approximately). The ethnic group differences concerning intent to continue in ROTC were not significant.

The factors that the cadets saw as having an influence on their decision concerning the Advanced Course are presented in Table 30. Sex and ethnic background differences were not apparent on either the most important influence, or on the top three influences combined. There was a definite overall ranking of the influences that was similar whether the most important influence alone or all three influences combined were examined. In the combined list, the influences picked by the highest percentages of cadets were career goals, personal beliefs, family, educational goals, and ROTC instructors. In deciding whether or not to sign up for the Advanced Course with its contractual post-college obligated service, the cadets were apparently giving serious consideration to the Army as a career, and were evaluating the match between the Army and their personal goals and beliefs.

Cadets were also asked what effect a guarantee of serving their military obligation in the Army Reserve or the National Guard would have on their decision to continue into the ROTC Advanced Course. Neither the sex nor the ethnic background difference reached significance. The majority of the cadets stated that such a guarantee would have no effect. The guarantee would make the Advanced Course more attractive to about 25% of the cadets however.

There were significant sex and especially ethnic group differences regarding possession of and hope for an ROTC scholarship. Relatively more males than females hoped to get a scholarship, and a higher percentage of males than females also presently had one. The ethnic breakdown revealed that proportionately more whites than blacks or Hispanics held scholarships, but that a considerably higher percentage of blacks and Hispanics than whites wanted one. Black and Hispanic cadets, perhaps more than female cadets, saw ROTC as a means to help finance a college education.

When cadets were asked about the type of Army service they were planning for after college (Active Duty Training vs Active Duty Reserve vs Regular Army) no clear pattern emerged. Sex did not have a significant effect, but ethnic group did. Relatively higher percentages of whites and Hispanics were planning Regular Army careers. These plans reflect reality

Table 31
 ROTC Cadets: Commitment-Related Attitudes

Commitment Variables	ROTC Cadets						Test of Significance, Ethnic Background
	Fe-male	Male	Test of Significance, Sex	Black	Hispanic	White	
<u>Intent to Continue in ROTC</u>			$\chi^2(2)=17.85***$				$\chi^2(4)=NS$
<u>% Will Not Sign Up Next Year</u>	25.2	11.8		15.9	13.6	17.5	
<u>% Will Sign Up for at Least One More Year</u>	34.1	25.7		34.6	28.8	25.3	
<u>% Will Go Through Advanced Course</u>	40.7	62.4		49.5	57.6	57.2	
<u>Mean, Intent to Continue ROTC with No Living Allowance</u>	3.25	3.31	$t(361)=NS$	3.13	3.42	3.33	$F(2,360)=NS$
<u>Mean, Intent to Join Army if No ROTC Contractual Obligation^a</u>	2.98	3.06	$t(362)=NS$	2.95	3.15	3.04	$F(2,361)=NS$
<u>Intended Length of Army Service</u>			$\chi^2(4)=NS$				$\chi^2(8)=NS$
<u>% Minimum Under ROTC Obligation</u>	17.6	14.4		21.0	15.3	12.7	
<u>% One or Two Years Beyond Obligation</u>	3.2	4.2		4.8	5.1	3.0	
<u>% Three to Five Years Beyond Obligation</u>	3.2	5.5		4.8	5.1	4.6	
<u>% More than Five Years Beyond Obligation</u>	9.6	18.2		13.3	16.9	15.7	
<u>% Don't Know</u>	66.4	57.6		56.2	57.6	64.0	
<u>Mean, Intent to Make Career of Army^a</u>	2.78	3.02	$t(361)=NS$	2.94	3.19	2.85	$F(2,360)=NS$
<u>Mean, Total Score on Army/ROTC Commitment Scale</u>	11.90	13.01	$t(362)=2.56*$	12.33	13.31	12.57	$F(2,361)=NS$
<u>Mean, ROTC Scholarship Holders, Likelihood of Having Joined ROTC Without Scholarship^a</u>	3.64	3.50	$t(58)=NS$	4.23	3.80	3.29	$F(2,57)=NS$
<u>Mean, ROTC Scholarship Holders, Likelihood of Continuing ROTC Without Scholarship^a</u>	3.86	3.20	$t(58)=NS$	4.00	4.00	3.07	$F(2,57)=NS$

Note.

The numbers in parentheses following the χ^2 , F, and t statistics are the degrees of freedom on which the significance of χ^2 , F, and t were evaluated.

^a1=Definitely not; 5=Definitely

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

in the sense that a higher proportion of white as opposed to black cadets are awarded Regular Army commissions upon college graduation. Overall, most cadets had not reached a definite decision regarding which type of service they planned to enter, although many were leaning toward one type or another.

Several questions concerning the degree of commitment of the cadets to ROTC and the Army were asked in addition to the basic question (previously discussed) of their intent to continue in ROTC. With one exception, neither sex nor ethnic background had a significant effect. The responses to the questions can be seen in Table 31. The cadets were asked if they would stay in ROTC if no living allowance were provided in the last two years. The response mean was above the midpoint of the scale. The cadets were then asked if they would join the Army after college if they did not have a contractual obligation from ROTC. Here the response mean hovered around the scale midpoint, indicating that the cadets either did not know at this point or were divided in their answers. The cadets were also asked about how many years they intended to serve in the Army. While the majority of the cadets either did not know (over 50%) or intended only to serve the minimum under their ROTC obligation (around 15%), a small group of apparent careerists was present. This group, consisting of about 10% of the female cadets and 18% of the male cadets, stated that they intended to serve more than five years beyond their ROTC obligation. Finally, the cadets were asked directly whether they intended to make a career of the Army. Again the response mean was close to the midpoint of the scale indicating either uncertainty or variance in cadets' responses.

The responses to all four of these questions were combined with the response to the question concerning intent to continue in ROTC to produce an Army/ROTC commitment scale. The possible range of scores on this scale was from 4 to 22, with a midpoint of 13. As can be seen in Table 31, male cadets had a significantly higher mean than females, although the males were just at the midpoint of the scale. There were no ethnic background differences on the composite scale.

ROTC cadet scholarship holders were asked two additional questions concerning the extent to which their participation in ROTC was contingent on their scholarship. The responses of the 50 scholarship holders in the sample are presented at the bottom of Table 31. Again, neither sex nor ethnic background had a significant effect. The scholarship holders, especially those of black or Hispanic origin, responded somewhat positively (means ranging from 3.07 to 4.23 on a 5-point scale) when asked whether they would have joined ROTC if they had not been offered a scholarship and whether they would continue in ROTC without the scholarship. It is apparent that scholarship holders were not participating in ROTC solely because they had an ROTC scholarship.

-
6. Card, J. J., Goodstadt, B. E., Gross, D. E., and Shanner, W. M. Development of a ROTC/Army career commitment model. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1975.

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The previous chapter presented analyses based on a 232-item questionnaire filled out by a stratified random sample of 931 college students. This chapter will summarize the major findings from the survey, and then will focus on the conclusions that can be drawn from them and their implications for ROTC recruitment.

Summary

There were eight topic areas covered by the survey: demographic background, military-related background, media preferences, education-related information, career-related information, knowledge of ROTC and the Army, Army- and ROTC-related attitudes, and military career plans of ROTC cadets. This section summarizes findings from each topic area. Readers who have gone through the previous Results chapter in detail may wish to skip this section and proceed immediately to the Conclusions and Implications section.

Demographic Profile

1. General background characteristics. The respondent sample was stratified according to ROTC Membership (ROTC cadet and non-ROTC student), Year in School (freshman and sophomore), Location of School (ROTC Region 1, 2, 3, and 4), Sex (male and female), and Ethnic Background (black, Hispanic, and white). By design, therefore, there were adequate numbers of respondents representing these varied backgrounds.

2. Family income. Students reported a higher average family income than did cadets, with much of the difference due to the especially high family income of white students and the especially low family income of black cadets. Whites in general reported higher family incomes than blacks or Hispanics.

3. Size of community of socialization. Most of the cadets and students grew up in small or medium cities, but the sample had disproportionately more rural blacks, large city Hispanics, and suburban whites.

Military-Related Background

1. ROTC and military experience of family and friends. ROTC cadets reported more contacts with the military while they were growing up than did students: proportionately more cadets than students had relatives and friends with experience in ROTC and the military. A higher proportion of white cadets and students reported that relatives of earlier generations had military experience; a higher proportion of blacks and Hispanics reported that relatives from their own generation were in ROTC or the military. Proportionately more male than female cadets reported that their father was in the military.

2. Parents' and friends' attitudes toward an Army officer career. Cadets thought that their parents and their friends would attribute a higher status to an Army officer career than did students, with black and Hispanic respondents giving higher estimates than whites. Estimates for parents' attitudes were higher than for friends' attitudes.

Media Preferences

1. General media preferences. ROTC cadets and non-ROTC students were markedly alike in their preferences for various categories of media. Newspapers, television and radio, general magazines, and sports/outdoor magazines were top rated by both groups.

2. Magazine preferences. Overall, the top rated magazines in the list of 39 presented to respondents were Time, Newsweek, TV Guide, Reader's Digest, Sports Illustrated, National Geographic, People, and U.S. News and World Report. When a magazine was targeted to a particular subgroup (e.g., men's vs women's magazines; black magazines) it appeared to be highly successful in reaching proportionately more members of the targeted subgroup. In a write-in section of the survey, over 5% of the cadets or students stated that they also occasionally or regularly read Playboy, Glamour, Seventeen, and Penthouse.

3. Television program preferences. Favorite television shows included Mork and Mindy, MASH, and 60 Minutes for most groups, with blacks also preferring Jeffersons, Diff'rent Strokes, and What's Happening.

4. Radio program preferences. The two categories of radio programming most frequently cited as favorites by the Hispanic and white cadets and students were FM and rock. Blacks however tended to prefer soul or jazz ahead of rock.

Education-Related Variables

1. College major. Relatively more ROTC cadets reported that they were majoring in the physical sciences, biological sciences, and engineering; relatively more students were majoring in the social sciences or the liberal arts. Overall, males and females tended to have "traditional" college majors (e.g., relatively more males in engineering; relatively more females in education). Relatively more whites were majoring in the physical sciences and engineering, relatively fewer Hispanics in business, and relatively more blacks and Hispanics in "Other," miscellaneous categories.

2. Sources of college finance. Cadets and students were financing their college education similarly (with the exception of ROTC scholarships), but the pattern for the three ethnic groups was different. Relatively more whites were obtaining financial support from their families, relatively more blacks and Hispanics from scholarships other than ROTC, relatively more white than black or Hispanic cadets had ROTC scholarships.

3. School grades. Female and white cadets and students reported the highest grade point averages in high school but significant differences among the subgroups' school grades were no longer found in college.

4. Influences on educational plans. While cadets attributed a greater influence to relatives, counselors, and those in the career on their educational plans than did students, all influences were rated quite moderately. Females rated the influence of others on educational planning higher than males, blacks higher than Hispanics or whites. For every group except white cadets, a greater influence on educational plans was attributed to the mother than to the father.

Career-Related Variables

1. Salary expectations. All the respondents were aiming at earning a substantial salary 10 years after college, with males aiming higher than females (\$30,500 vs \$26,500).

2. Career expectations. The career plans of cadets and students paralleled their choices of college major for the most part, and again males and females followed rather traditional career lines. While only about 16% of the ROTC cadets identified military officer as their first choice of career, over 50% identified it as one of their top three choices. More male cadets than female cadets (60% vs 35%) identified military officer as one of their top three career choices.

3. Important dimensions sought in a job. When presented with a list of 21 job dimensions and asked to rate the importance of each, cadets generally provided higher ratings than did students. Cadets and students included three of the same dimensions in their most important five (Advancement Opportunity, Interesting/Challenging Job, and Self-Improvement), but cadets also top rated Job Security and Personal Freedom while students top rated Family Contentment and Interesting People. Cadets and students agreed that Geographic Desirability and More Schooling were two of the three least important job dimensions. Females relative to males, and blacks and especially Hispanics relative to whites, rated the importance of the job dimensions more highly overall.

4. Ratings of the Army on various job dimensions. When asked to estimate the potential for satisfaction of the same list of job dimensions by an Army officer career, cadets provided significantly higher ratings than students in every case. Cadets and students included the same dimensions as being best satisfied by an Army officer career (Job Security, Advancement Opportunity, Chance to be a Leader, Self-Improvement, and Adventure) and the same dimensions as being least satisfied (Stability of Home Life, Personal Freedom, and Geographic Desirability). Again, females more than males, and blacks and especially Hispanics more than whites, rated the potential satisfaction of the dimensions in the Army higher overall. Only one subgroup (white students) gave one dimension (Personal Freedom) a mean Army satisfaction rating lower than the scale neutral point.

Knowledge of ROTC and the Army

1. Knowledge about ROTC and the Army. Cadets stated that they knew more about ROTC than did students, and indeed relatively more cadets than students answered the knowledge test questions accurately. Non-ROTC students were aware of many aspects of ROTC and the Army, but tended to overestimate some of the obligations entailed and underestimate some of the benefits.

2. Time of awareness of ROTC and ROTC scholarship program. Surprisingly, many students became aware of ROTC and the ROTC scholarship program earlier than cadets. In fact, over 43% of the cadets did not become aware of the ROTC scholarship program until college. Males became aware of ROTC relatively earlier than females.

3. Sources of awareness of ROTC and ROTC scholarship program. Relatively more cadets became aware of ROTC and the ROTC scholarship program from other people (Family, ROTC Personnel, and Military Personnel) or pamphlets, while relatively more students became aware from television and radio or newspaper and magazine ads. Black cadets reported the highest familiarity with ROTC from media ads. Substantial numbers of cadets and students stated that media presentations helped make them aware of ROTC and the scholarship program, but in no case were media ads among the most frequently mentioned sources of awareness.

Army and ROTC Variables

1. Participation in and evaluation of Junior ROTC. A higher percentage of cadets than students and a higher percentage of Hispanics than blacks or whites participated in high school ROTC (JROTC). Cadets rated various aspects of JROTC higher than students, who generally gave negative ratings.

2. Influences on decision whether or not to join ROTC. A significantly higher proportion of cadets than students stated that other people (Family, Teachers/Counselors, ROTC Recruiters, ROTC Instructors, and Military Personnel) were influential in their decision to join ROTC; proportionately more students than cadets said that their Personal Beliefs, the Military Lifestyle, their Career Goals, the ROTC Unit Requirements, and the ROTC Obligated Service were influential in their decision not to join. Taken as a group, cadets and students most often cited Personal Beliefs, Career Goals, Friends, and Family as being the most important influences on their decision about ROTC. Only about 9% of the cadets and 4% of the students stated that media advertisements were among the top three influences on this decision.

3. Evaluation of college ROTC. Cadets rated different aspects of college ROTC significantly higher than did students. Students generally gave neutral ratings, except to the Scholarship and Guaranteed Job aspects of ROTC, which they rated positively. Females and Hispanics tended to provide the highest ratings of the subgroups studied. All ratings of college ROTC were higher than ratings of high school ROTC on similar dimensions.

4. Evaluation of various attributes of the Army. Cadets rated different institutional aspects of the Army significantly higher than did students, who generally gave negative ratings except to the attributes concerning Army Pay and Benefits and Job Security. Cadets and students agreed that Job Security, Pay and Benefits, Officer Responsibilities, and Recreation were among the most attractive aspects of the Army. They also agreed that Personal Freedom, Prejudice, and Living Arrangements were the least attractive. Females and Hispanics provided the highest ratings generally, and male students and white students provided the lowest ratings.

5. Attitudes toward military service. A much higher percentage of cadets than students, and proportionately more males than females, felt an unconditional duty to serve in the military or a duty to serve if needed. Relatively more students than cadets, and relatively more females than males, would not serve even if called, or had not given serious thought to military service. Relatively fewer Hispanics than blacks or whites reported that they would not serve if called, or the other extreme: that they felt an unconditional duty to serve.

No non-ROTC student subgroup provided a positive average rating when asked whether a guarantee of serving in the Army Reserve or the National Guard would have affected their decision not to join ROTC. No non-ROTC student subgroup provided a positive average rating when asked if they intended to join the Army after college without participating in ROTC. Hispanic students provided the least negative and white students the most negative ratings to these questions.

ROTC Cadets: Military Career Plans

1. Time when decision to join ROTC was made. The majority of the ROTC cadets in the sample stated that they decided to join ROTC in high school, but almost 25% did not make that decision until reaching college.

2. Intention to continue into the ROTC Advanced Course. A much higher percentage of male than female cadets intended to continue in ROTC through the Advanced Course; a higher percentage of female cadets did not intend to continue with the next year of ROTC. The most important influences on the cadets' decisions concerning joining the Advanced Course were Career Goals, Personal Beliefs, Family, Educational Goals, and ROTC Instructors. A guarantee of Army Reserve or National Guard duty after college would have increased the likelihood of joining the ROTC Advanced Course for a minority (about 25%) of the cadets.

3. ROTC Scholarships. Proportionately more male than female cadets, and proportionately more black and Hispanic than white cadets hoped to receive an ROTC scholarship. Relatively more males and whites held scholarships at the time the survey was conducted. The ROTC cadet scholarship holders replied quite positively when asked if they would have joined ROTC without the scholarship, and whether they would continue in ROTC without a scholarship.

4. Plans for Army service. There were no clear patterns either in the type of Army service planned by the cadets or in their intended length of service. A majority of cadets were either undecided about their plans, or merely leaning in one direction or another without having made a definite decision. However, about 20% of the cadets stated that they were definitely planning for Regular Army service, and about 14% stated that they planned to serve more than five years beyond the ROTC obligated period. The average of cadet responses was in the neutral to slightly positive range for items asking if they would stay in ROTC if there were no living allowance during the Advanced Course, if they would join the Army after college if there were no ROTC contractual obligation, and if they intended to make a career of the Army.

Conclusions and Implications

The purpose of the study was to identify current values and attitudes of various subgroups of college students to aid ROTC's national, regional, and local advertising and recruitment efforts. Differences between cadets and their classmates, between males and females, and among black, Hispanic, and white college students will now be discussed from the point of view of their implications for recruitment.

ROTC Cadet/Non-ROTC Student Differences

Replication of previous work. The ROTC cadets were found to be very different from the rest of the college population; obtained differences replicated, almost perfectly, those revealed in AIR's 1975 career commitment model survey. An impressive example of the degree of congruence can be found in the respondents' perceptions of how their parents and friends would rate an Army officer career. In the first survey, the ratings attributed to friends were 3.28 for cadets and 2.86 for non-ROTC students (on a 5-point scale with 5 being the most positive rating). In the present survey these figures were 3.25 and 2.81 respectively. Respondents in both surveys felt that their parents would rate an Army career higher than their friends would rate it. The first survey obtained ratings for parents of 3.90 for cadets and 3.33 for non-cadets; the corresponding figures in the present study were 4.09 and 3.47.

Both surveys employed sample stratification procedures which precluded the testing of significance for several demographic variables. Cadets and non-cadets appeared alike in both surveys, however, in terms of age (cadets slightly younger), type of community in which they grew up, and socio-economic status (cadets slightly lower). The two surveys also showed remarkable consistency in eliciting respondents' military socialization. In both cases it was found that cadets reported more relatives and friends as having been in ROTC or the military than did non-cadets.

The changes that did occur in the time between the two surveys appear to have resulted in a decreasing difference between cadets and non-cadets. For example, in 1975 cadets reported lower high school and college grade point averages and less participation in high school extracurricular activities than non-cadets; these differences did not show up in the present survey. Further, cadets in the first survey expected to earn a higher salary than non-cadets; this no longer seems to be the case.

In most other respects the similarities and differences between cadets and non-cadets have changed little. In both surveys cadets reported greater interest in having careers as military officers or engineers and less interest in careers such as teaching or being a housewife. Job dimensions of greater importance to cadets in both studies included the opportunity for more schooling, the chance to be a leader, a sense of adventure, job

-
7. Card, J. J., Goodstadt, B. E., Gross, D. E., and Shanner, W. M. Development of a ROTC/Army career commitment model. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1975.

security, and the opportunity for advancement. Cadets were consistent in 1975 and 1979 in their belief that the Army would satisfy these and other job needs; non-cadets were less optimistic about the extent to which the Army could prove to be a viable career.

In terms of their knowledge about ROTC and the Army, cadets and non-cadets again displayed a high degree of consistency over time. In an 18-item true/false test, non-cadets in both surveys were just as aware as cadets concerning ROTC scholarships, the availability of ROTC for women, and the fact that an officer can resign after an obligated period of duty. Non-cadets in the current survey were also aware of Army-financed postgraduate schooling; in all other instances their military-related knowledge fell short of cadets' knowledge.

Although a substantial amount of correspondence between the two surveys is no guarantee that either one was totally accurate, it is very encouraging. It suggests that both studies were successful in reaching representative samples of college youth, and that the findings can be viewed with considerable confidence.

The career commitment model. The differences between young men and women that lead a few to join ROTC but most to either reject it or not seriously consider it in the first place can be described in terms of a model. Again, AIR's previous work in the area provides a framework for viewing obtained results. According to the AIR (Card, et al.) model, one's socio-economic background and socialization experiences while growing up, plus one's aptitudes, help to form a personal set of values, interests, aspirations, and attitudes about careers. The process of career choice and commitment includes a continuous matching of new information and experiences about a career to the personal value set (which itself is changing, in part due to the new experiences). If there is a suitable match, the career exploration process continues, and new socialization conditions can affect the degree of commitment. If there is no match between the basic personal value set and the critical dimensions of a career, no exploration takes place; unless the value set changes, secondary socialization conditions are not likely to make the career more attractive.

The model applies to career choice and commitment in general, but the role of the personal value set may assume additional importance when a career as an Army officer is being considered. Because of its unique role in society, the military may not be viewed in exactly the same light as other potential employers, and perhaps it should not be. The ultimate role of the military to use force in protecting the society is a component of a military career, and the members of the military must accept that role for the military to succeed.

The survey results can be fitted to the model just described quite nicely. Many ROTC cadets and non-ROTC students reported that their personal beliefs were one of the top influences on their decision concerning ROTC (see Table 13). If ROTC is viewed as an exploratory step toward establishing oneself in an Army career, the cadets must have had a suitable match between their beliefs and Army career components, while some of the students did not. The different sets of personal beliefs held by the cadets and students may be due in part to their different backgrounds and early

socialization conditions, namely the greater degree of contact the cadets had with the military while growing up (see Table 7).

Further evidence of a mismatch between the values of some students and Army career components comes from the fact that students generally rate aspects of the Army as a job positively, and quite highly in some cases (e.g., job security, advancement opportunity, and chance to be a leader--see Table 11). But the same students rate aspects of the Army as an institution or a lifestyle negatively, and include the goals of the Army and the relevance of the military to society in these negative categories (see Table 13). The value set of the cadets, however, was such that they were willing to consider an Army career; secondary socialization conditions--e.g., parents' advice, contact with an ROTC recruiter--could then influence this consideration.

Implications of the model for recruitment messages. There is evidence that some students who have not joined ROTC may hold values that will allow them to consider the Army as a viable career: 2.6% of the students reported that they felt an unconditional duty to serve in the military; 41% reported that they felt a duty to serve if needed (see Table 13). If the model accurately describes the present situation, as indeed it seems to, then there are two general strategies that may be effective in recruiting college-bound young men and women into ROTC and an Army officer career. The first strategy is traditional; it involves targeting the recruiting effort at those individuals who because of their present personal values, interests, aspirations, and attitudes, are open to considering the Army as a career. The task in this case is to present relevant information to show these individuals how an Army career can satisfy their aspirations, and fulfill those aspects of a job they most highly prize. For the current group of cadets, the survey results show that the most important job dimensions are Advancement Opportunity, Job Security, Interesting/Challenging Job, and Self-Improvement (see Table 11).

The second strategy can only be tentatively suggested here; its ethics and utility need further evaluation. This strategy is to target information directly to that fairly large set of students who hold personal values and beliefs negative to the military and therefore are not willing to seriously consider an Army officer career. An effort might be made to point out the legitimate, necessary, and useful functions of the military in society in an attempt to influence the values of these students. As the survey revealed, students rate most aspects of the Army as an institution or lifestyle negatively--Personal Freedom, Living Arrangements, Prejudice, Training, Discipline, Army's Public Image, Day-to-Day Activities, Personal Relationships, Relevance of Military to Society, and Goals of the Army (see Table 13). Whether these values and beliefs can be modified by recruiting efforts, or whether an attempt should even be made to do so using the national media, are open questions. It is rather clear, however, that one's personal values and beliefs, if strongly held, can be a greater influence on career decision making than practical economic and personal gain considerations.

Additional suggested recruitment messages. The survey results suggest some messages that could be successful in recruiting those students who are willing to at least consider an Army officer career. It was found that the most popular college major for both cadets and students was business, but

that compared to students, relatively more cadets were majoring in the physical and biological sciences and engineering (see Table 10). Significantly more cadets than students also said that their first choice of career was in engineering, physical science, mathematics, and architecture (see Table 11). Recruiting efforts can take special care to point out the opportunities in the Army for young men and women with interests in these and other top rated fields. The apparent relationship between certain educational and career field interests and interests in an Army officer career can be highlighted in media advertising.

The identification of job dimensions important to both cadets and students also provides a set of topic areas for recruiting efforts (see Table 11). Advertisements can feature information on the degree to which the Army can satisfy concerns about advancement opportunities, interesting and challenging jobs, and self-improvement opportunities. The recruiting efforts can also be directed at presenting a realistic picture concerning those job dimensions that young men and women do not think the Army can satisfy. The same type of approach can be taken in presenting a realistic picture of the obligations and benefits that go along with an Army career, since many students overestimate some of the obligations and underestimate some of the benefits (see Table 12).

The scholarship program is one of the few features of college ROTC that was rated positively by non-ROTC students. It was quite surprising to find that 43% of the cadets in the sample and almost 30% of the students did not become aware of the scholarship program until college (see Table 12). Since the program is viewed as being attractive but its existence is not universally known by high school students, it could be a good candidate for a recruiting feature. It should be pointed out, however, that prior AIR work⁸ has shown that scholarships bring young people into ROTC, but are not correlated with longer retention among recruited students.

Male/Female Differences

Having analyzed the implications of ROTC cadet/non-ROTC student differences for ROTC recruiting, the discussion now turns to male/female differences. The survey gathered considerable evidence that females have their sights on a plane with males in terms of what they want in a career, and see the Army as having a greater potential for satisfying their desires than do males: Females rate the importance of 21 different job dimensions as high or higher than males, and see the Army as being able to satisfy those dimensions much more positively than do males (see Table 26). Females also tend to rate aspects of college ROTC and other institutional aspects of the Army significantly higher than males (see Table 29). However, there is evidence that once females become involved in the Army through ROTC, they are more likely either to drop out or to be unsure of their commitment (see Table 31). Females may be expecting the Army to provide more of an opportunity or an adventure for them than it actually does, and a career exploration into ROTC fails to confirm their high expectations. The most

-
8. Card, J. J., Goodstadt, B. E., Gross, D. E., and Shanner, W. M. Development of a ROTC/Army career commitment model. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1975.

important influences on the decision to join ROTC reported by female cadets were friends and ROTC instructors, while male cadets reported family, personal beliefs, and career goals (see Table 29). The indication here is that a decision to enter ROTC by females is often a tentative step based less on long-term influences and goals than on somewhat more transient influences.

Earlier research conducted by AIR⁹ also revealed that females had lower commitment to ROTC and an Army career than males, despite their more favorable attitudes toward the Army. An explanation put forward for that finding was that the apparent gap in the military attitude-behavior link among females was largely due to the common view that the military was a "male" career. Females were interested and supportive spectators of the career but had chosen not to become, or had been prevented from becoming, full participants. The social mores defining the military as a male career may still be operating strongly enough that they can outweigh the impressions females have that the Army is a viable career environment.

Recruiting efforts can be addressed to the female military attitude-behavior gap by not only pointing out the extent to which the Army environment can satisfy the career goals of females, but by making them aware that they are choosing a non-traditional career and that this may present some special challenges. If these special challenges are not addressed during recruiting and during the initial year of contact with ROTC, a highly successful recruiting effort with females may lead to a larger retention problem downstream.

Ethnic Group Differences

Ethnic group differences also have an impact on ROTC recruiting. Previous research has shown ROTC to be traditionally composed of white males from conservative, middle-income backgrounds with considerable military experience in their families. However, the 1977 Gilbert survey recently reported by ARI¹⁰ revealed that increasing numbers of cadets were black, from the South, and from lower-income families.

The Army itself has become more integrated in recent years, and results from the present survey show that it is now viewed quite positively by black and Hispanic cadets and students. In almost all instances in the survey when a rating of some aspect of ROTC or the Army was requested--e.g., ratings of aspects of high school and college ROTC (see Table 29), ratings of the expected satisfaction of important job dimensions in the Army (see Table 26), ratings of institutional and lifestyle aspects of the Army (see

-
9. Card, J. J. Subgroup differences in ROTC/Army career commitment and in commitment-related attitudes. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1976.
 10. Hicks, J. M., Collins, T., and Weldon, J. I. Youth aspirations and perceptions of ROTC/military: A comparison. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1979.

Table 29)--blacks and Hispanics provided higher ratings than whites. It does not appear that blacks and Hispanics are more attracted to the Army by patriotic reasons: Relatively more whites feel that it is their duty to serve either unconditionally or when needed (see Table 29). Rather, blacks and Hispanics view the Army as a good career opportunity. There is evidence that blacks and Hispanics are taking increasing advantage of this opportunity: Relatively more blacks and Hispanics report friends and relatives of the present generation with military experience, while relatively more whites report relatives of earlier generations with military experience (see Table 15).

The fact that the two minorities view most aspects of an Army career positively indicates that ROTC recruiting efforts aimed at these subgroups could be successful. The much lower reported average income of the parents of blacks (cadets especially) and Hispanics (see Table 14) suggests that these students should, in general, be attracted by economic offers. If they are shown that ROTC can help finance college expenses and lead to a strong guarantee of a job with a substantial salary, they may be willing to seriously consider joining ROTC. The degree of attraction may be proportional to the financial help that ROTC can offer during college. If ROTC can be restructured to provide subsistence allowances during the Basic Course, scholarships based on economic need, or a college loan program with repayment deferred until after an extended obligated Army duty period, many more qualified blacks and Hispanics could perhaps be attracted. Note that among members of the present sample, proportionately more whites than blacks or Hispanics received ROTC scholarships (see Table 30).

The very fact that there are increasing numbers of minority group members in the military can also be utilized in recruiting members of minority groups. These students can be shown that ROTC and the Army are viable career environments in which they will be able to work along with others from a similar background. They will not be isolated representatives of a minority in an organization completely dominated by supervisors and co-workers of a different ethnic background.

It may prove to be relatively more difficult to recruit qualified whites into ROTC (note the already discussed unfavorable attitudes of many whites toward the Army as an institution and/or a lifestyle). Whites probably have greater competing career alternatives in civilian life than do members of minority groups. This competition has to be taken into account in recruitment efforts.

Outlets for Recruitment Messages

The previous sections presented information concerning potentially useful recruiting messages. This section turns to the means for getting these messages to the target populations. The survey addressed the media usage habits of college students, and the degree to which media advertisements were both sources of awareness of ROTC and influences upon joining ROTC. The survey cannot make cost-benefit analyses of the payoffs expected from advertising in specific media, but it can make some suggestions about the role of media in recruiting. First, there is no evidence that media

advertisements have a direct influence on young men's or women's decisions to join ROTC. Only about 9% of the college cadets in the survey said that media advertisements were one of the three top influences in their decision to join ROTC (see Table 13). Much higher percentages of the cadets reported that personal beliefs, career goals, ROTC instructors, friends, and family were an important influence. Note that three of these influence types are people.

There is some evidence, however, that the media may have an indirect effect on young people's decision to join ROTC, in that media advertisements help to make students aware of ROTC. Almost 50% of the cadets reported that radio or television and magazine or newspaper ads helped make them aware of ROTC. Almost 70% of the cadets said that pamphlets were a source of awareness (see Table 12). Recruiting efforts using media could capitalize on these findings, and concentrate on the secondary role of informing young people of the existence of ROTC rather than presenting arguments for joining the program.

There is a second twist in using the media in an informative rather than an exhortative mode: this approach can have an indirect influence by keeping influential others--family and friends--aware of the program.

The fact that most ROTC cadets decided to join ROTC when they were in high school or in their freshman year of college (see Table 30), coupled with the fact that people were among the most often reported influences on joining ROTC (see Table 13), suggests that a recruiting effort by people (college ROTC cadets perhaps) in high schools supplemented with an awareness-oriented media campaign could be successful.

The greater degree of contact with the military that the cadets experienced while growing up may not have direct implications for media approaches to ROTC recruitment advertising, but it suggests an alternative strategy. This survey and those previously conducted along the same lines have all pointed out the importance of early socialization--in terms of early military contact--on the decision of some college-bound men and women to join ROTC. This fact cannot be manipulated by recruiting efforts but it can be exploited. Direct mailouts to military veterans in the age bracket most likely to have children in high school could be effective. Cadets have shown that they value the opinions of their parents concerning ROTC (see Table 13); reminders to parents about the advantages of ROTC, especially when the parents had military experience, could have a substantial payoff.

Tables 8, 9, and 16-24 present information on the media preferences of ROTC cadets and other college students that can be used in recruitment planning. The data identify the most popular media categories, and present the students' favorite magazines, television, and radio programs. It should be noted that several women's magazines not on the list provided to students by TRADOC are read by a substantial number of female college students. Direct recommendations of specific media cannot be made in this report as cost information for various outlets is not available. However, the data in the tables suggest outlets to consider for media recruitment campaigns.

DISTRIBUTION

ARI Distribution List

4 OASD (A&RA)
 2 HQDA (DAMI CSZ)
 1 HQDA (DAPE PBR)
 1 HQDA (DAMA AR)
 1 HQDA (DAPE HRE PO)
 1 HQDA (SGRD ID)
 1 HQDA (DAMI DOT C)
 1 HQDA (DAPC PMZ-A)
 1 HQDA (DACH PPZ-A)
 1 HQDA (DAPE-HRE)
 1 HQDA (DAPE-MPO C)
 1 HQDA (DAPE DW)
 1 HQDA (DAPE-HRL)
 1 HQDA (DAPE CPC)
 1 HQDA (DAFD MFA)
 1 HQDA (DARD ARS P)
 1 HQDA (DAPC PAS A)
 1 HQDA (DUSA OR)
 1 HQDA (DAMO RQR)
 1 HQDA (DASG)
 1 HQDA (DA10 PI)
 1 Chief, Consult Div (DA OTSG), Adelphi, MD
 1 Mil Asst Hum Res, ODDR&E, OAD (E&LS)
 1 HQ USARAL, APO Seattle, ATTN: ARAGP R
 1 HQ First Army, ATTN: AFKA OI TI
 2 HQ Fifth Army, Ft Sam Houston
 1 Dir, Army Stf Studies Ofc, ATTN: OAVCSA (DSP)
 1 Ofc Chief of Stf, Studies Ofc
 1 DISPER ATTN: CPS/OCF
 1 The Army Lib, Pentagon, ATTN: RSB Chief
 1 The Army Lib, Pentagon, ATTN: ANRAL
 1 Ofc, Asst Sect of the Army (R&D)
 1 Tech Support Ofc, OJCS
 1 USASA, Arlington, ATTN: IARD T
 1 USA Rsch Ofc, Durham, ATTN: Life Sciences Dir
 2 USARIFM, Natick, ATTN: SGRD UE CA
 1 USATTC, Ft Clayton, ATTN: J1110 MOA
 1 USAIMA, Ft Bragg, ATTN: AISU LTD OM
 1 USAIMA, Ft Bragg, ATTN: Marquat Lib
 1 US WAC Ctr & Sch, Ft McClellan, ATTN: Lib
 1 US WAC Ctr & Sch, Ft McClellan, ATTN: Tng Dir
 1 USA Quartermaster Sch, Ft Lee, ATTN: ATSM TE
 1 Intelligence Material Dev Ofc, EWL, Ft Holabird
 1 USA SE Signal Sch, Ft Gordon, ATTN: ATSO EA
 1 USA Chaplain Ctr & Sch, Ft Hamilton, ATTN: ATSC-TE RD
 1 USATSCH, Ft Eustis, ATTN: Educ Advisor
 1 USA War College, Carlisle Barracks, ATTN: Lib
 2 WRAIR, Neuropsychiatry Div
 1 DLI, SDA, Monterey
 1 USA Concept Anal Agcy, Bethesda, ATTN: MOCA MR
 1 USA Concept Anal Agcy, Bethesda, ATTN: MOCA-JF
 1 USA Arctic Test Ctr, APO Seattle, ATTN: STEAC-PL-MI
 1 USA Arctic Test Ctr, APO Seattle, ATTN: AMSTE-PL-TS
 1 USA Armanent Cmd, Redstone Arsenal, ATTN: ATSK-TEM
 1 USA Armanent Cmd, Rock Island, ATTN: AMSAR-TDC
 1 FAA-NAFEC, Atlantic City, ATTN: Library
 1 FAA-NAFEC, Atlantic City, ATTN: Human Engr Br
 1 FAA Aeronautical Ctr, Oklahoma City, ATTN: AAC-44D
 2 USA Fld Arty Sch, Ft Sill, ATTN: Library
 1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: Library
 1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: ATSB-DI-E
 1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: ATSB DT TP
 1 USA Armor Sch, Ft Knox, ATTN: ATSB DT AD
 2 HQUSACDEC, Ft Ord, ATTN: Library
 1 HQUSACDEC, Ft Ord, ATTN: ATEC-EX-E -Hum Factors
 2 USAEEC, Ft Benjamin Harrison, ATTN: Library
 1 USAPACDC, Ft Benjamin Harrison, ATTN: ATCP-HR
 1 USA Comm-Elect Sch, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: ATSN-EA
 1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: AMSEL CT HDP
 1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: AMSEL-PA P
 1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: AMSEL SI-CB
 1 USAEC, Ft Monmouth, ATTN: C, Facd De. Br
 1 USA Materials Sys Anal Agcy, Aberdeen, ATTN: AMXSY-P
 1 Edgewood Arsenal, Aberdeen, ATTN: SAREA BL-H
 1 USA Ord Ctr & Sch, Aberdeen, ATTN: ATSL-TEM-C
 2 USA Hum Engr Lab, Aberdeen, ATTN: Library/Dir
 1 USA Combat Arms Tng Bd, Ft Benning, ATTN: Ad Supervisor
 1 USA Infantry Hum Rsch Unit, Ft Benning, ATTN: Ch...f
 1 USA Infantry Bd, Ft Benning, ATTN: STEBC-TE-T
 1 USASMA, Ft Bliss, ATTN: ATSS-LRC
 1 USA Air Def Sch, Ft Bliss, ATTN: ATSA CTD ME
 1 USA Air Def Sch, Ft Bliss, ATTN: Tech Lib
 1 USA Air Def Bd, Ft Bliss, ATTN: FILES
 1 USA Air Def Bd, Ft Bliss, ATTN: STEBD-PO
 1 USA Cmd & General Stf College, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: Lib
 1 USA Cmd & General Stf College, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATSW-SE-L
 1 USA Ctr J & General Stf College, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: Ed Advisor
 1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: DepCdr
 1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: CCS
 1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATCASA
 1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATCACO-E
 1 USA Combined Arms Cmbt Dev Act, Ft Leavenworth, ATTN: ATCACO-CI
 1 USAECOM, Night Vision Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: AMSEL-NV-SD
 3 USA Computer Sys Cmd, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: Tech Library
 1 USAMERDC, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: SISFB-DQ
 1 USA Eng Sch, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: Library
 1 USA Topographic Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: ETL TD-S
 1 USA Topographic Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: STINFO Center
 1 USA Topographic Lab, Ft Belvoir, ATTN: ETL GSL
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: CTD MS
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATS-CTD-MS
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-TE
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-TFX-GS
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-CTS-OR
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-CTD-DT
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-CTD-CS
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: DAS/SRD
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: ATSI-TEM
 1 USA Intelligence Ctr & Sch, Ft Huachuca, ATTN: Library
 1 CDR, HQ Ft Huachuca, ATTN: Tech Ref Div
 2 CDR, USA Electronic Prvg Grd, ATTN: STEEP MT-S
 1 HQ, TCATA, ATTN: Tech Library
 1 HQ, TCATA, ATTN: ATCAT-OP-Q, Ft Hood
 1 USA Recruiting Cmd, Ft Sheridan, ATTN: USARCPM-P
 1 Senior Army Adv., USAFAGOD/TAC, Elgin AF Aux Fld No 9
 1 HQ, USARPAC, DISPER, APO SF 96558, ATTN: GPPE-SE
 1 Stimson Lib, Academy of Health Sciences, Ft Sam Houston
 1 Marine Corps Inst, ATTN: Dean-MCI
 1 HQ, USMC, Commandant, ATTN: Code MTMT
 1 HQ, USMC, Commandant, ATTN: Code MPI-20-28
 2 USCG Academy, New London, ATTN: Admission
 2 USCG Academy, New London, ATTN: Library
 1 USCG Training Ctr, NY, ATTN: CO
 1 USCG Training Ctr, NY, ATTN: Educ Svc Ofc
 1 USCG, Psychol Res Br, DC, ATTN: GP 1/62
 1 HQ Mid-Range Br, MC Det, Quantico, ATTN: P&S Div

1 US Marine Corps Liaison Ofc, AMC, Alexandria, ATTN: AMCGS-F
 1 USATRADO, Ft Monroe, ATTN: ATRO-ED
 6 USATRADO, Ft Monroe, ATTN: ATPR-AD
 1 USATRADO, Ft Monroe, ATTN: ATTS-EA
 1 USA Forces Cmd, Ft McPherson, ATTN: Library
 2 USA Aviation Test Bd, Ft Rucker, ATTN: STEBG-PO
 1 USA Agcy for Aviation Safety, Ft Rucker, ATTN: Library
 1 USA Agcy for Aviation Safety, Ft Rucker, ATTN: Educ Advisor
 1 USA Aviation Sch, Ft Rucker, ATTN: PO Drawer O
 1 HQUSA Aviation Sys Cmd, St Louis, ATTN: AMSAV-ZDR
 2 USA Aviation Sys Test Act, Edwards AFB, ATTN: SAVTE--T
 1 USA Air Def Sch, Ft Bliss, ATTN: ATSA TFM
 1 USA Air Mobility Rsch & Dev Lab, Moffett Fld, ATTN: SAVDL-AS
 1 USA Aviation Sch, Res Tng Mgt, Ft Rucker, ATTN: ATST-T-RTM
 1 USA Aviation Sch, CO, Ft Rucker, ATTN: ATST-D-A
 1 HQ, DARCOM, Alexandria, ATTN: AMXCD-TL
 1 HQ, DARCOM, Alexandria, ATTN: CDR
 1 US Military Academy, West Point, ATTN: Serials Unit
 1 US Military Academy, West Point, ATTN: Ofc of Milt Ldrshp
 1 US Military Academy, West Point, ATTN: MAOR
 1 USA Standardization Gp, UK, FPO NY, ATTN: MASE-GC
 1 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 452
 3 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 458
 1 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 450
 1 Ofc of Naval Rsch, Arlington, ATTN: Code 441
 1 Naval Aerospc Med Res Lab, Pensacola, ATTN: Acous Sch Div
 1 Naval Aerospc Med Res Lab, Pensacola, ATTN: Code L51
 1 Naval Aerospc Med Res Lab, Pensacola, ATTN: Code L5
 1 Chief of NavPers, ATTN: Pers OR
 1 NAVAIRSTA, Norfolk, ATTN: Safety Ctr
 1 Nav Oceanographic, DC, ATTN: Code 6251, Charis & Tech
 1 Center of Naval Anal, ATTN: Doc Ctr
 1 NavAirSysCom, ATTN: AIR-5313C
 1 Nav BuMed, ATTN: 713
 1 NavHelicopterSubSqua 2, FPO SF 96601
 1 AFHRL (FT) Williams AFB
 1 AFHRL (TT) Lowry AFB
 1 AFHRL (AS) WPAFB, OH
 2 AFHRL (DOJZ) Brooks AFB
 1 AFHRL (DOJN) Lackland AFB
 1 HOU SAF (INYSO)
 1 HOU SAF (DPXXA)
 1 AFVTG (RD) Randolph AFB
 3 AMRL (HE) WPAFB, OH
 2 AF Inst of Tech, WPAFB, OH, ATTN: ENE/SL
 1 ATC (XPTD) Randolph AFB
 1 USAF AeroMed Lib, Brooks AFB (SUL-4), ATTN: DOC SEC
 1 AFOSR (NL), Arlington
 1 AF Log Cmd, McClellan AFB, ATTN: ALC/DPCR8
 1 Air Force Academy, CO, ATTN: Dept of Bel Scn
 5 NavPers & Dev Ctr, San Diego
 2 Navy Med Neuropsychiatric Rsch Unit, San Diego
 1 Nav Electronic Lab, San Diego, ATTN: Res Lab
 1 Nav TrngCen, San Diego, ATTN: Code 9000-Lib
 1 NavPostGraSch, Monterey, ATTN: Code 55Aa
 1 NavPostGraSch, Monterey, ATTN: Code 2124
 1 NavTrngEquipCtr, Orlando, ATTN: Tech Lib
 1 US Dept of Labor, DC, ATTN: Manpower Admin
 1 US Dept of Justice, DC, ATTN: Drug Enforce Admin
 1 Nat Bur of Standards, DC, ATTN: Computer Info Section
 1 Nat Clearing House for MH- Info, Rockville
 1 Denver Federal Ctr, Lakewood, ATTN: BLM
 12 Defense Documentation Center
 4 Dir Psych, Army Hq, Russell Ofcs, Canberra
 1 Scientific Advsr, Mil Bd, Army Hq, Russell Ofcs, Canberra
 1 Mil and Air Attache, Austrian Embassy
 1 Centre de Recherche Des Facteurs, Humaine de la Defense Nationale, Brussels
 2 Canadian Joint Staff Washington
 1 C/Air Staff, Royal Canadian AF, ATTN: Pers Std Anal Br
 1 Chief, Canadian Def Rsch Staff, ATTN: C/CRDS(W)
 4 British Def Staff, British Embassy, Washington

1 Def & Civil Inst of Eriro Medicine, Canada
 1 AIR CRESS, Kensington, ATTN: Info Sys Br
 1 Militaerpsykologisk Tjeneste, Copenhagen
 1 Military Attache, French Embassy, ATTN: Doc Sec
 1 Medecin Chef, C.E R.P.A.-Arsenal, Toulon/Naval France
 1 Prin Scientific Off, Appl Hum Engr Rsch Div, Ministry of Defense, New Delhi
 1 Pers Rsch Ofc Library, AKA, Israel Defense Forces
 1 Ministeris van Defensie, DOOP/KL Afd Sociaal Psychologische Zaken, The Hague, Netherlands